THEOLOGY

VOL. LX MARCH, 1957 No. 441

Bible Reading in a Busy Life

THE church-goer is exhorted in sermons and addresses to undertake regular study of the Bible and is offered much good advice on how to do it. He will readily admit the necessity for it, but he is probably immersed in the absorbing demands of a job, a home, friends and parish doings. Bible study can become an occasion for a guilty feeling that he ought to be doing better rather than a help to daily life. He must feel an obvious and compelling reason for studying the Gospels if he professes to be a Christian, but he may find difficulty in keeping his interest in the rest of the field—too often the also-rans.

This is a personal account of five ways in which one such ordinary Christian has tried to study the Bible, though I realize that the inadequacy may be traced to myself rather than to the methods I have tried to follow.

First, we are told that we must not read the Bible superficially, but must ponder it and study to grow in the knowledge of God. To "read, mark, learn and inwardly digest" is difficult advice to-day. We read so much ephemeral writing quickly and carelessly that it is an effort for us to linger over a phrase or ponder an incident. We gulp our books in large doses, snatching the time somewhat guiltily from the many things we should be "doing"! There may be some who carefully put a marker in a book after the daily ration of a dozen pages, but many busy people read a novel quickly when they are tired, probably a detective novel if they can get a good one these days. Some keep their more serious reading for holidays or occasional week-ends when they can give a longer space of time; they read quickly and purposefully. Others have dropped out of the habit of reading anything very serious at all. The Bible is the only book they are asked to read thoroughly and thoughtfully, and it is the more difficult as many of the stories are blunted by familiarity so that they do not need to read on to find out what happens next. What I find happens is that my eyes linger on a verse which offers inspiration or comfort through its familiarity or happy turn of phrase and then they rush ahead to find another good one. Just as Hamlet is full of quotations, so I have come to think of Isaiah as centring on chapter 53 or the Epistle to the Romans existing for the sake of a few passages like: "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?"

Another incentive to Bible reading we are given is that the Bible holds the truth enshrined in great literature. Everyone has some passage which is great literature for him; for me, the Psalms and the Book of Revelation (without at all understanding what it means). Yet here again, the Bible is something different from our other reading. It would need but little knowledge of books widely read to-day to see that they are very different in approach from the highly

stylized writing of Job, or the Books of the Kings, or from the somewhat involved sentences of St Paul. To someone who is weary or preoccupied, a reading from the Old Testament can seem a succession of meaningless phrases: "Thus saith the Lord"; "and it came to pass"; "the land which the Lord your God giveth you"; and the Epistles can become a patchwork of fine phrases without any clear pattern linking them. So often a quickening of the will to worship God comes not from the Bible, but from a writer who seems to work on the same wavelength as oneself—for me, perhaps Mother Julian, or John Donne or Charles Williams or Dante, so wonderfully rediscovered in our day by Dorothy Sayers.

New translations are useful in telling us what the Bible means, to one scholar at any rate, but they do not pretend to a high literary standard. The question I am trying to pose is not "How shall we know what the Bible says?" but "How can we combat the ennui which is apt to creep over us when we are trying to read regularly a literature which is foreign to our background and tastes and habits in reading?"

The third line of approach is more significant in Bible study. The Bible is the account of God's dealing with man, through the preparation in the Old Testament of a peculiar people to the Incarnation and the New Covenant. From time to time a sermon or a book presenting the whole picture on a wide canvas stirs me to fresh interest in the Bible, but it fades with equal regularity when I am faced with a "portion of Scripture" to be read each day. The temperature of my enthusiasm for the Bible drops as I move away from each successive inspiration. When one is faced with a chapter of the minor prophets or with one of the more obscure passages of the epistles, it is not easy to hold the whole pattern in mind as a key which will give significance to each part. While the answer may be to read more than isolated snippets at a time, the multiplicity of things and people drives us sometimes to keeping going with a bare minimum each day.

Very probably a deeper knowledge of the biblical background would help one to make more sense of each part, and I suspect that others as well as I have many unfulfilled schemes for reading a bit of ancient history, learning about the meanings of the original words used, catching up with the latest discoveries in manuscripts and archaeology. They are unfulfilled because I have little time, and certainly little capacity, for academic study. While some people read always about the Bible rather than read the Bible (just as we may know all about God rather than know him), more people give a few minutes here and there to reading snippets of the Bible which are unsupported by the kind of knowledge that would bring them to life. Is it possible that there is not enough of the kind of background literature that would help us or are we not making the right use of what there is?

The next point may present itself more sharply to one who was brought up in a fundamentalist creed and came to the Church of England at years of comparative discretion. While one cherishes the infinitely precious, if infinitely vague, Anglican temper, there are

times when one envies those who hold to an authoritarian point of view. If we say on the one hand that every word of the Bible is inspired truth or on the other that the Church decides exactly how we are to interpret the Bible, we know where we are going and can give some account of the faith that is in us. Ask an Anglican layman to-day how he interprets the first chapters of Genesis or what St Paul teaches about the institution of the Blessed Sacrament or what the Revelation of St John is about, and his answer will probably be the more lucid and definite the less he has listened to sermons on the Bible and read the latest books on the subject—or, as more usually happens, reviews of the latest books in the *Church Times*. Future generations will benefit from the advances in biblical knowledge and interpretation which are being made to-day, but they can seem to those struggling with them a confused and contradictory pattern. It would be better probably to ignore them and to read the Bible as simply as we can, but this is difficult advice for those who try to probe deeper to find meaning in the Bible. In any case, we are sometimes given in the sermons we hear hints and whiffs of the latest wind which has blown the preacher on a particular tack. Who will define for the layman what the Bible means to members of the Church of England at this point of time?

Finally, the biblical way which is especially dear to many Anglicans is following the pattern of our liturgy. We hear the Epistle and Gospel at the Holy Communion service; we follow the lessons in Mattins and Evensong. This seems a fruitful way of reading the Bible for busy people who can share publicly or privately in the services of the Church. There are a few practical considerations here. The first is the old enemy—time. To follow any kind of connected pattern, it is advisable to read both Mattins and Evensong daily which is beyond the powers of many of us unless it is to monopolize the whole time we manage to set aside for the practice of prayer each day. Then, when these services are said in our parish churches, they are either read in a professional monotone so that the meaning is buried beneath a liturgical seemliness when they have a strong hypnotic effect on the hearer, or they can be disturbingly histrionic. This is perhaps unfair on the reverent and intelligent reading of the Bible in many places, but I must confess to a preference for hearing the lessons read by a layman to whom it is an effort to make sense of the Authorized Version and who, therefore, takes trouble to read it clearly and simply.

The simple answer to these and other queries raised by the effort of Bible study may be the best: that we must go on reading it whether we want to or not and that the best approach is "not to worry". There must be an element of sacrifice in giving time to this as to other spiritual exercises and busy people feel the pinch hardly at times. Yet those of us who are at the receiving end of advice given by the experts wonder if they realize our background and limitations sufficiently well to interpret their knowledge of the Bible to us. I, for one, am anxious to learn, as I realize that a simplicity and depth flow from the loving familiarity with the Bible which is a rare part of our heritage.

OLIVE PARKER.

The Disordered Economic Thinking of the National Church

The National Church and the Social Order, brilliantly written by Mr P. Mairet for the Social and Industrial Council of the Church Assembly,[1] which takes full responsibility for the opinions in it, is a most useful history of the post-Reformation views of the Church of England on social questions. In a small space, it summarizes a wide range of literature. Starting with Hooker and the traditional teaching on Natural Law, it passes, through the last storms of the anti-usury pamphleteers, to the doldrums of the eighteenth century. It then retells the story of the nineteenth-century revival of social prophecy, and the development from Christian Socialism to the varied movements of the twentieth century. It reveals a rich tradition, which contains a more or less consistent approach over many years, pinpointed in the last chapter dealing with "Leading Questions" of the day; this presumably outlines some of the topics to be dealt with in the full report for which this is the *hors d'œuvre*. For many years the commonplace of Anglican discussion, this consistent approach can be traced from the early Christian Socialists to the Christendom group and the orthodoxies of Malvern and Lambeth. It has been enshrined in a historiography, duly reflected in this report's bibliography.

"A Social and Industrial Council is primarily concerned with human relations in their economic setting."[2] Fortunately, the report does not confine itself to economic matters, but deals most refreshingly with many more general social and political matters. As an economist, I confine my attention to the parts concerned with economics and economic history, and what follows deals only with certain limited parts of the report. My thesis is that the various economic themes, which have almost become a matter of Anglican orthodoxy, are based on a deep-seated ignorance of economic history and analysis. It is a tragedy that the Church of England has had in its history few social thinkers acquainted with economic analysis; those it has had are largely unknown to present-day writers on the Anglican tradition.[3] The tradition of present-day writers has been built up in a series of writings where ignorance of economic theory and institutions is only matched by the arrogance of the denunciation of, and contempt for, those who have this knowledge. These writers have thus managed to persuade many, who rightly respect their intellectual competence and brilliance in other fields, that their judgments in the field of economics are to be taken equally seriously.[4]

[1] Church Information Board, 5s. 6d. [2] P. 9.

[3] For example Bishop Berkeley, Dean Tucker, Archbishop Whately, Bishop Copleston, Whewell, and no doubt there are more of whose significance no one is aware. Paley is mentioned in this report.

[4] I refer chiefly to what may loosely be termed "the Christendom group", whose views on these topics have in fact been widely accepted by people unaware of their origin. In my *Christianity and Economic Problems*, I have shown where Professor Demant's *Religion and the Decline of Capitalism* betrays an

The result is a report like the present one, which will continue to confuse the unlearned, reduce the effectiveness of the Church's social witness, and lead those circles where economic questions are taken seriously to an even greater contempt for Church pronouncements than they now possess. It is indeed not always clear how far this report shares the erroneous views it quotes; hence my criticisms may not always apply equally to the S.I.C. as to the tradition.

1. Economic History

I make no claim to any particular knowledge of economic history, but there are a number of places where the implied picture of events appears to be so grossly distorted that a mere economist can but raise his eyebrows in wonderment.

(*a*) *The Emergence of "Capitalism".*

"The European revolution . . . proclaimed Interest on Capital, the Competitive Price and the de-ethicising of economic relations as its first principles" (p. 20).

"The war against usury, if the enemy be conceived as the insurgent power of the new trade finance . . . the world-invasion before which united Christendom had been forced to give ground. . . . The great social failure of the mediaeval Church was an unwillingness to see that the recrudescence of usury in new and formidable forms was not simply and solely an eruption of malicious wickedness; that in great part it was an a-social response to new, but genuine social, needs" (pp. 27–28).

"To intelligent minds of that time the growing hegemony of money-interests was connected clearly enough with the failure to keep usury outlawed" (p. 29).

"While others retreated into the fastnesses of the inner life, or tried to repair crumbling ramparts against the invading Mammon of unrighteousness . . ." (p. 32).

"The demonic power of acquisitiveness let loose by the commercial and industrial revolution" (p. 65).

This kind of language seems to betray that "lack of any systematic study of what was really happening to society" for which the report rightly criticizes a certain phase of seventeenth-century religious thought (pp. 53–4). Readers will want to know not only what Christians in the past thought, but also how far their estimate of events was accurate. All too much history of Christian social thinking has failed because the authors were not adequately aware of the realities of economic development, in this case the growth in trade, production and inventions.

(*b*) *The "Hungry Forties" and the "Great Depression".*

"When once the slump of the forties was over, the country entered upon its greatest period of industrial expansion and prosperity. National wealth grew rapidly. . . . And when, in 1879, the industrial situation changed

ignorance of economic theory and fact. I hope elsewhere to analyse in detail the false economic theories common to this group; some of the points come out below. To substantiate the charge of contempt for economists, reference may be made to Maurice Reckitt's *Religion in Social Action* (1937), pp. 50, 64–5; *The Christian in Politics* (1946), pp. 36–7, 71, 80; *Prospect for Christendom* (1945), p. 94; *Maurice to Temple* (1947), pp. 26, 157. The passage from this report quoted below under 2 (*b*) is typical. I find no evidence in the works quoted above of any actual acquaintance with the works of the economists whose views are treated so cavalierly.

again, and a severe recession caused mass unemployment and a clamour of discontent. . . . Although the economic barometer fell sharply in the mid-seventies, this was after a long period of booming trade; and the people did not lose faith that prosperity would return—as it did before the end of the eighties" (pp. 96, 98).

This account of events is the commonplace of Christian social historians;[1] unfortunately, it bears little relation to the facts as reported by modern economic historians. The troughs of the trade cycle in these years were 1867 or 1868, 1879, 1886, and peaks of the boom were 1873 or 1874, 1883, 1889 or 1890.[2] There is evidence that real wages increased more rapidly in the last quarter of the century than in the third quarter, even allowing for unemployment, which, it can be argued, was rather more serious.[3] The fact that people were worried about a "Great Depression" in the last quarter of the century, when production seems to have been rising fast (faster than after 1900, if less fast than in the third quarter[4]), is a fact to be explained, not evidence for what was happening. One of the leading modern sources for the analysis of economic trends in Britain in the nineteenth century shows faster rates of growth between 1818 and 1855 than between 1856 and 1876.[5] It is not clear that the forties as a whole were a period of slump, leaving out the bad year of 1847.[6]

(*c*) *The Eighteenth Century.*

(1) "The material fact that competitive-commercial economy divided society into two parts—there was a minority growing richer and richer, and a majority growing poorer, more insecure and falling into squalor, disease and crime. . . .

(2) The Revolution, with its centralisation of finance in the Bank of England . . ." (p. 63).

With these we may contrast:

(1) G. N. Clark: "There is no doubt that the benefits were widely diffused, that, with some minor exceptions, every group in the country was materially better off at the accession of George III than at the accession of Charles II. . . . By the time of George III . . . although the poorest were still miserably poor, comfort and well-being had spread, if unevenly, through all the land."[7]

(2) J. H. Clapham, the historian of the Bank of England: "The goldsmith bankers . . . found that there was room both for them and it: some of them kept accounts with it in very early days—a small beginning of the process which in time, long time, well after 1750, made it the bankers' bank."[8]

---

[1] Cf. M. B. Reckitt, *Maurice to Temple*, pp. 21, 116–18, 122, 125, 139; *The Church and the World*, Vol. III, p. 55 f., 119.

[2] W. W. Rostow, *British Economy of the Nineteenth Century*, p. 33; W. Beveridge, *Full Employment in a Free Society*, p. 312. It is a matter of judgment as to the exact dating of a turning-point and annual averages are misleading. But the comparison of these two sources suggests enough agreement for our purposes.

[3] Rostow, op. cit., p. 91.

[4] W. W. Rostow, *The Process of Economic Growth*, p. 267; W. A. Lewis, *Economic Survey, 1919–1939*, p. 204.

[5] W. Hoffman, *British Industry, 1700–1950*, p. 31.

[6] J. H. Clapham, *An Economic History of Modern Britain*, Vol. I, chap. 14.

[7] *The Wealth of England, from 1496 to 1760*, pp. 185, 191. Cf. J. H. Clapham, *A Concise Economic History of Britain*, p. 214.

[8] Ibid., p. 273.

(*d*) *The "Later Phases of the Industrial Age".*

> "The new economy produced wealth in greater quantity than ever, but failed to distribute it with even minimum efficiency. The more mechanically production was organised, the more capriciously its benefits were shared out, and the more necessary it became for public relief, in one way or another, to keep the working population in health or even alive" (p. 134).

It is not obvious that in fact the development of industry has led to a more capricious sharing of the benefits. It is certainly not true that, even without the growth of forced redistribution of wealth, it becomes "more necessary" to provide for the poor. The Marxian theory of the growing immiseration of the workers, of which this is a revised version, has been fairly decisively disproved by the facts.

Knowledge of the important variables of economic history, even for fairly recent periods, is limited. What the above references show is not so much that the report is demonstrably wrong, but that it dogmatically chooses one among alternative views, on what appear to be somewhat "ideological" grounds, without careful scrutiny of the views of reputable modern scholars.

2. Economic Analysis

(*a*) *Money.*

Throughout the report there recurs a theory that control of industry by "the money power" has been a dominant cause of our troubles. This is one of the pseudo-analyses, which has attracted undue and misleading attention by "Christian sociologists" ignorant of monetary theory; it is, of course, also one of the keynotes of orthodox Leninist analysis and social credit fallacies. The two sections on pp. 140–2 dealing with "Money" and "Money as a Measure" are tainted with these theories, and are seriously misleading in a number of points.

Sentences such as—

> "In the new society there is a change in the character of money." "This outcry against money power was directed also against the banks and financial authorities in general, whose 'monopoly of credit' kept money in short supply." "Actually, the supreme criterion for financial management is still the national solvency, which depends chiefly upon maintaining the value of the currency in the markets of the world." "The limit to this kind of government by delayed concession is the point beyond which the inflation of the currency . . . may suddenly cheapen it in the world's markets and lower the whole of the national real income"—

sentences such as these, though some of them include considerable elements of truth and could be defended, are misleading ways of describing the relations between money supply and economic activity, internal and external price levels, the level of employment and the rate of exchange. To describe devaluation of the pound as "lowering the whole of the national real income" is marginally true, but effectively false.[1]

[1] The national real income is reduced to the extent that more exports have to be provided in order to buy the same quantity of imports, which may or may not have a large effect on the national real income. In the circumstances in question, when devaluation is necessary to offset an internal rise in wages, it merely restores the position before wages rose. The wage-rise has resulted in a gain in real income at the expense of a deterioration in the balance of payments; precisely as a debtor gains in real consumption power as long as he over-spends his income.

The discussion of the possibility of "controlled inflation", i.e. a slow rise in prices, fails to show the pros and cons of rising, stable or falling prices. It is not true to say that "the maintenance of the value of money is a duty upheld in theory by very nearly all financial authorities", if by this is meant the desirability of stable prices as an alternative to slowly rising or falling prices. To condemn the alternatives because "a moral theology based on the Bible must condemn this palliative as unjust in principle because a primary function of money is to be a *measure* of value. The Law and the Prophets denounce all falsification of measures (thou shalt not make the ephah long, etc.)" is both to misunderstand the various functions of money and to confuse counsel by the kind of simple quotation of biblical texts, from which Anglican social thinking has fortunately been largely free.

Misunderstanding of the function of money is clearly revealed in a discussion of usury on p. 25:

> "The one point that the canonists never surrendered in principle . . . was the axiom that the possession of a sum of money gives its owner no moral right whatever to receive more money simply as a compensation for not himself expending the original sum. They saw money as the medium of exchange, an unspent sum of it therefore as a claim upon the wealth of society, and it was obviously both irrational and immoral to pretend that the existence of this claim was in itself a basis for further claims."

A slight acquaintance with modern "liquidity-preference" theories would show that at least one reason, and perhaps the fundamental one, why interest is paid on money lent is because parting with money deprives the owner of the convenience that money affords. (If I lend my bank balance to a neighbour, who will return it with certainty in six months, and I am faced with a sudden emergency requiring cash, I am put to considerable inconvenience; his debt to me is not a substitute for cash.) It may be immoral that interest is paid in these circumstances, it is certainly not "irrational", and it only appears so to those who do not take the trouble to engage in economic analysis. While the canonists may be excused for their ignorance of what none then properly understood, modern moralists should at least take the trouble to study the best information that modern knowledge can provide as to the activities about which they moralize (which is not to say that economists claim fully to understand everything about interest, or any other aspect of the economic system).[1]

(*b*) *Economists.*

> "The earlier 'political arithmetic' had now grown into the methodology which is still the basis of economic science to-day. Economics was simply the special study of production, trade and finance, insulated from other studies (almost of necessity) by regarding men as if they were individuals motivated purely by unlimited acquisitiveness. . . . The simple answer—that the mechanisms of trade are not everything and that a society gets richer by the amount of work that is *not* done purely for selfish acquisition—was not given by the economists, perhaps for fear of making their work look less important" (p. 78).

[1] It is not true (at least of economists) that "we justify continuous interest on all capital accumulation as a means of distributing the growing wealth of society while maintaining its structure" (p. 26).

This passage embodies both a misunderstanding of the nature of economics and an assertion as silly as any alleged of the economists. The rather cheap sneer at the economists is unnecessary. Perhaps it is sufficient to say that "economic man" is not a necessary methodological assumption of economics, and that a society gets richer by the work done, whether motivated by selfish or unselfish reasons.[1]

(*c*) *Exploitation of Resources.*

> "Exalting production and consumption into the aim and end of social policy, the world-industrial revolution has hitherto ransacked the earth for fuel, food and material with a buccaneering disregard of consequences, fouling the atmosphere, polluting rivers and seas and squandering fertility as fast as it multiplies population" (p. 149).

Extravagant assertions of this kind are the commonplace of certain Christian commentators. It is not obvious that, in its exploitation of the world's resources, the modern industrial world has always behaved with "a buccaneering disregard of consequences". Certainly this has sometimes happened. Often, however, the exploration and discovery of new sources has gone hand-in-hand with the exploitation of the old. Human consequences have often been ignored, but the human consequences of failing to exploit resources have equally often been ignored. To assert that fertility of the land has been squandered as fast as population has grown is disproved by the growth of the world's output of food. Fertility has in many places not grown as fast as population, but this is due to failure to exploit new methods fast enough.

(*d*) *The Minimum Wage and the Export Trade between the Wars.*

> "Responsible financial and industrial opinion was convinced—with very few exceptions—that the only cure was to increase export trade by cheapening export prices, which meant that wages must come down. . . . One had only to look into the facts of the situation to see that the maintenance of a minimum standard of living for the workers was not, and could not be, the first charge upon industry as the industrial system was in fact organised" (p. 116).

Even if we assume the premise of this argument, it does not follow from a reduction of money wages that a minimum standard of living for workers is impossible, unless the assumption about "the industrial system" includes a very wide range of assumptions about political and social possibilities. Steps could be taken in such a situation to reduce the incomes of other sections of the community by a greater amount than the reduction of money wages. (It is assumed, as was the case in the period under discussion, that the total reduction in national income that is required is not large, and that a "minimum standard of living" can be maintained out of the resources available.) In the inter-war period, it was the political and social system that was at fault, not "the industrial system". One chief factor at work was economic ignorance (see next point).

[1] See for example Lionel Robbins, *An Essay on the Nature and Significance of Economic Science*, pp. 94 f., for economic man, and chap. 3 of *Christianity and Economic Problems* for the nature of economics.

(*e*) *Keynes and Social Credit.*

On p. 120, the report deals with theories that "the financial system" was the cause of the unemployment of the inter-war years.

> "There were some distinguished economists, Lord Keynes among them, who alleged a failure of financial policy to distribute the products of industry. But at the popular level, the agitation for a new monetary system was led by the advocates of 'Social Credit', who . . ." (There follow several sentences dealing with "social credit".) "A good deal of this discussion, the merits of which lie outside our province, turned out to be over-simplified and misleading." But it then continues to explain how Christians were right "in furthering the criticism of finance".

Anyone who knows anything of the achievement of Keynes in revolutionizing our *analysis* of the functioning of the economic system, and who is sufficiently acquainted with the elements of monetary theory to know the incredible stupidity of social credit theories, can only regard such a passage as reflecting seriously on the competence of Anglican social thinkers, both past and present. It is as if a history of biblical scholarship after a glancing reference to the work of Kittel in explaining the Hebrew background of the New Testament continued to explain how on the "popular level" the work was taken up by writers such as Robert Graves. The significance of Keynes's work is not that he criticized financial policy, but that he *explained* for the first time how unemployment comes about, thereby making cure possible. It is unfortunately true that no Christian social writers, nor any advocate of social credit, made any contribution to this explanation.

(*f*) *Nationalization of the Bank of England.*

> "He did no more than draw attention to the far-reaching moral responsibilities inherent in the ability to create financial credit. . . . What he said went far to justify that enlargement of the State's prerogative in finance which, in fact, was soon to be signalized by the nationalization of the Bank of England" (p. 133).
>
> "In Britain, soon after the last war, the management of money and credit became, nominally, a State responsibility. Although this change . . ." (pp. 140–1).

These passages, with their rather loose use of the word "finance", seem to show an ignorance of the extent to which, since the Bank Charter Act of 1844, the State has in effect controlled currency and credit. The nationalization of the Bank of England made little, if any, difference to a situation that dates back at least to the abandonment of the gold standard in 1931.

(*g*) *The Just Wage and the Industrial Order.*

The passages on pp. 142-4 relating to the status of workers and shareholders and the legal constitution of companies entirely fail to face, as indeed is true of the whole report, the function of the business man (or "entrepreneur" or "capitalist" or (sometimes) "manager" or "company director" or "director" of a nationalized industry). This is one of the key questions in the analysis of the modern industrial system.[1]

[1] See chap. 10 of my *Christianity and Economic Problems*.

(*h*) *Minor Exaggerations.*

"The modern State's extension of control over the economic and other functions of society is necessitated not only by . . . but by the technical demand for order. Ever more potent forces of technical development have to be kept working in harmony" (p. 125).

"What is called 'automation' . . . threatens us with a *third* industrial revolution. . . . Nothing like the present development of technics came into the purview of Christian thinkers until the present century; tradition helps us little in trying to form a general estimate of its significance" (pp. 144–5).

"Since the new methodology and its criteria of value are those of technics, the scope for government by popular initiative and consent is less, rather than more, than it was in previous kinds of society" (p. 145).

All these statements seem to be either highly dubious and debatable or greatly exaggerated.

What I have written may seem unduly harsh and critical, but this report must be seen in the light of a bad tradition of economic thinking. A would-be economist, who is a Christian, can hardly help feeling annoyed (*a*) that Christians who know little, if anything, about economics should have presumed to be contemptuous of those he can only regard as colleagues in an arduous and painful attempt to extract some grains of truth about man and his activities, and (*b*) that the intellectual leaders of the Church of England should have misled those who urgently need guidance in some of the most baffling problems of our time. I do not hesitate to acknowledge the intellectual capacity and integrity of these writers. I share their theological presuppositions and the main outlines of their approach to the social order, I admire their intellectual grasp in fields outside my own,[1] and I readily admit that their ignorance may be due more to the faults of economists or the failures of those who have not spoken frequently, loudly, or clearly enough. But where nonsense takes the place of sense, and parades itself in the garb of knowledge, some sort of protest is required. The Archbishop of York is quoted as saying "It is for the sociologists to grumble until the theologians serve them better than they are doing at present".[2] The 5th Report of the Archbishops' Committee of Inquiry in 1918 said that the citizen "must inform himself on economic matters".[3] This report rightly tells us that the work of the Church is not merely to protest against evils, but also "to illuminate and to project".[4] As an economist, who believes that church people desperately need guidance, I would plead that, if the Church cannot open her mouth without talking economic nonsense, it would be better for her to be silent on economic matters, sad as it would be for the Church of England to admit that she had nothing to say.

D. L. Munby.

[1] Note that I have rigorously confined my attention to certain limited parts of this report.

[2] P. 150. [3] Quoted, p. 125. [4] P. 150.

Bound in the Spirit

THE MESSAGE OF ST PATRICK'S CONFESSION

St Patrick's inner battles and temptations, as he found the way to serve the living God, make an illuminating study in the spiritual life. Of the patron saints of Great Britain and Ireland, he alone has left us written documents which furnish a reliable *apologia pro vita sua*. The early date of the *Confession* and the *Epistle to Coroticus* make both these works of special interest to those who would glean some account of Northern Catholicism in the fifth century.

The *Confession* is an "open letter" written with a missionary purpose in mind. Many of its phrases are conventional, but all of them are unquestionably sincere. Consciously or unconsciously adopting a Pauline manner, Patrick has the care of the churches upon his heart; he mentions thousands whom he has evangelized. As a result, his sense of unworthiness is acute. The self-naughting phrases tumble over each other. "I was not worthy . . . I am the least of all . . . contemptible . . . puny." Gregory of Tours adopts the same tone and uses similar vocabulary.

Patrick's sense of inferiority is deep-rooted and he is aware that at times he must avoid the snares of the sin of that false humility which apes pride. He deplores his lack of learning, his clumsy prose style, his unfamiliarity with the Latin language which he uses in his letters as a medium for witnessing to his faith and spreading the news of the Gospel. Addressing his remarks to superior high-brows (*dominicati rethorici*) (*sic*), who may well be imaginary, he calls himself a clod-hoper (*rusticus*) and he labels his standard of education and learning—*rusticitas*. This does not prevent him from producing a charming literary phrase in self-defence, when he apologizes that his style of composition lacks taste and polish. "*Saliva scripturae*" has the ingenious touch of originality.

His *Confession* includes admittedly a confession of sin and general moral failure. There is one particular sin which beset him for years. In the manner of St Augustine, he harked back to one fatal hour on a certain day of his youth when he broke a commandment; he does not tell us which one. This proves a vulnerable point in his ministry and a running sore. Even a familiar friend whom he had trusted and who had encouraged him in his vocation to the ministry, dragged up the painful subject years later for some unknown reason. His family in an effort to keep him at home in Britain suggested unkindly that such a sin did not become episcopacy in the island across the sea. But we love Patrick all the more on account of his fall; this sin draws us closer to him. He is after all a flesh-and-blood figure, not obscured by coatings of legendary extravagance nor etherealized with fantastic miraculous achievements. His knowledge of forgiveness can help us all. This is how he felt: "Before I was afflicted I was like a stone lying in the deep mire, and he that is mighty came, and in his mercy lifted me up, and indeed raised me aloft and placed me on the top of the wall."

When he came to Ireland first, as a sixteen-year-old shepherd boy, he was what we could call a baptized pagan, indifferent to the claims of his religion and ignorant of the Christian faith. "I did not believe", he wrote, "I forsook God and did not keep his commandments." Perhaps this nominal Christian, like others, exaggerated his indifference when he recalled the fervour of his later life of faith and described his pilgrimage in retrospect. At any rate, as a slave boy, in a strange land, without the freedom and security of family life, he meets God face to face in an unmistakable spiritual experience. The spirit burned within him with such fervour that he felt no ill-effects from ice, snow and rain; alone on the hillside while tending his flocks, he prayed a hundred prayers a day. As he writes of his exacting spiritual exercises, words from Psalms and the New Testament describe his thoughts and convictions.

The *Confession* is also a profession of faith. Patrick sets out his credentials in the familiar credal statements found in the Church in Gaul and elsewhere in the early Christian fathers. The strong name of the Trinity drives him forward to the work of ministry; in this name he baptizes, confirms, and ordains. He feels committed to this work of sharing his spiritual discovery; he is bound in the Spirit. He knew what captivity meant, not alone on the hillside in Ireland, but also on board ship when, as a Christian, he was blamed for the stormy crossing and his prayers were derided as useless, and again when in chains for two whole months he fell a victim to his foes. To be held captive by the Spirit was for him by contrast a joyous and liberating experience. The people to whom he preached were enslaved by fear of idols and abominations; he does not mention Druids. When Patrick is tempted to doubt, he feels as if a rock descends on his body, pinning him down and depriving him of the power of his limbs, and to his mind by some kind of unconscious reflex spring half-formed words of a prayer to the Sun, whose cult held the people in the grip of superstition.

The cumulative effect of the *Confession* as a missionary document was exceedingly powerful. Patrick's Latin, if simple and unadorned, is quite clear in its meaning. He bears strong witness to the goodness and severity of God whom he approaches on occasions with fear and trembling; there is pathos in "*timore et terrore*". But, underlying his testimony, the note of thanksgiving for the wonderful way in which God has sustained him through temptations, within and without, sounds confidently to encourage the others. As a person, Patrick was sensitive to atmosphere, impulsive and perhaps over-anxious; but he always turned to God for the solution of his problems and in a life of persevering, persistent prayer lay his strength. In this way he heard the divine voice which called him to action. The voice at night had said to the shepherd boy, "Lo, thy ship is ready." The voice of a man with a sheaf of letters in his hand summoned him back to Ireland, "We beseech thee, holy youth, to come hither and walk among us!" A vision made him hesitate; did he see his own face with his name written beside it, without the title "bishop"? Was this a test or a warning? The voices and visions would scarcely have been sensed

without the long, unsensational training in faith and obedience. He describes in a classical passage what such a call is. "I saw God praying in me. . . . I was as it were inside my own body. . . . I heard him above me; that is, above my inner being." Again he writes of the guidance he receives: "Whether within me or beside me, I cannot tell, God knoweth, a voice." Here is the picture of the dedicated Patrick to whom the Christocentric words of the Breastplate have, for obvious reasons, been ascribed:

> Christ be with me, Christ within me,
> Christ behind me, Christ before me,
> Christ beside me, Christ to win me,
> Christ to comfort and restore me.

His aim, as he wandered about for Christ, was to capture men and women for whole-hearted service in the Church. He called his work "hunting and fishing". In the days of the monastic structure of organized Christian life, he won many from the families of chieftains and princes to a life of poverty and obedience. With his own abhorrence of falsehood and lies, with his own bitter experience of the frailty of human nature, he proclaimed the joys of a life bound in the fellowship of the Holy Spirit.

GEORGE DUBLIN.

James Ussher as Churchman—II

"I BELIEVE", commented Ussher's biographer, Elrington, "it will be found that a devoted student has never made an efficient bishop".[1] The same authority also observes that "no particulars have been transmitted to us of the manner in which the Bishop of Meath managed his diocese, nor of the measures he adopted to improve the wretched state of his clergy and their churches, which are so fully described in the report made in the first year of his consecration to the regal visitation".[2] There is a strong hint indeed of neglect of his diocese in the rebuke administered by the primate to Ussher in 1622 on the occasion of his sermon before the Lord Deputy on the use of the sword against papists. "Withal it will not be amiss in mine opinion for your lordship to withdraw yourself from those parts and to spend more time in your own diocese, that such as will not hear your doctrine may be drawn to love and reverence your lordship for your hospitality and conversation. Bear with the pains of an old man's pen, and leave nothing undone to recover the intercourse of amity between you and the people of your charge."[3] Undoubtedly the chief point of the letter was to rebuke Ussher for an ill-timed advocacy of persecution of papists; but the implication of lack of

[1] Ussher's *Works*, I, p. 122, footnote.
[2] Ibid., p. 62.
[3] Ibid., XV. Letter 54, p. 184. Archbishop Hampton to Ussher, 17 October 1622.

proper attention to his diocese cannot be easily avoided. On the other hand, Ussher strove to remove his unsatisfactory chancellor in the interests of incorrupt administration, as he afterwards testified to Bishop Bedell: "If my chancellor doth wrong, the Star Chamber lieth open, where I will be the man that will cast the first stone at him myself, as I did for the removing and censuring of him whom I found at my first coming into the diocese of Meath."[1]

The mention of William Bedell, Bishop of Kilmore, raises the far graver charge that Ussher as primate failed to support, but rather hindered, the efforts of one of the bishops of his province to reform his ecclesiastical courts, to dismiss a recalcitrant chancellor, to limit pluralism and to set forward the conversion of the natives by the provision of an Irish Bible and Catechism and by the encouragment of a clergy able to preach to them in their own tongue. When Bedell left the academic controversies which he had encountered as Provost of this College for the ecclesiastical conflicts of the see of Kilmore, he encountered formidable obstacles to the good ordering of his episcopal administration. A particular difficulty arose when he refused presentation to the benefice of Kildromfarten to the Dean of Kilmore, Dr Bernard, who was Ussher's chaplain, and wrote vehemently to the primate in defence of his refusal. "Plainly I do thus think, that of all the diseases of the Church in these times, next to that of the corruption of our courts, this of pluralities is the most deadly and pestilent, especially when those are instituted into charges ecclesiastical who, were they never so willing, yet for want of the language of the people, are unable to discharge them."[2] This associated question of the use of the Irish tongue was one in which Ussher showed to greatest disadvantage. In theory he was oppressed by the prevalent ignorance of the people and professed his utmost anxiety to counteract its ill-effects. "The woful estate of the poor country wherein I live," he observed in a sermon before James I in England in 1624, "is much to be lamented, where the people generally are suffered to perish for want of knowledge, the vulgar superstitions of popery not doing them half that hurt that the ignorance of those common principles of the faith doth, which all true Christians are bound to learn. The consideration whereof hath sometime drawn me to treat with those of the opposite party and to move them, that howsoever in other things we did differ one from another, yet we should join together in teaching those main points, the knowledge whereof was so necessary to salvation and of the truth whereof there was no controversy betwixt us. But what for the jealousies which these distractions in matters of religion have bred among us, and what for other respects, the motion took small effect."[3] Bedell, therefore, when he desired to translate the Bible into Irish and to circulate a short catechism in Irish and English, might have confidently expected the support of his primate. Instead Ussher dismissed the

[1] Ussher's *Works*, XV. Letter 161. 23 February 1629. Ussher to Bedell.
[2] Ibid. Letter 178, p. 531. 18 September 1630. Bedell to Ussher.
[3] Ibid., II, p. 499. "A Brief Declaration of the Universality of the Church of Christ."

venture as "building such castles in the air".[1] The comment of Elrington is severe but just. "The objection affords a melancholy instance of the strength of prejudice. The primate, who could so convincingly argue upon the impropriety of prayers in an unknown tongue and upon the necessity of translating the Scriptures into different languages, yet failed to apply his own principles to the case immediately before him, the case of the Irish nation. Blinded by the false notion of upholding English influence by exterminating the Irish language . . . the primate censured as a mode of confirming superstition and idolatry, the first judicious attempt that had been made to spread the doctrines of the Reformation throughout the country."[2]

The next problem concerned ecclesiastical courts; for Bedell had inhibited his chancellor on the ground that his patent was null and void, and sat himself as judge in his own consistory court. Indeed he was convinced that the abuses of the courts Christian were an even graver handicap to the church than pluralism. "Amongst all the impediments to the work of God amongst us, there is not any one greater than the abuse of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. . . . The time was when I hoped the Church of Ireland was free from this abuse, at least freer than her sister in England; but I find I am deceived . . . I have been wont also in Ireland to except one court; . . . but, trust me, my lord, I have heard that it is said among great personages here, that my lord primate is a good man, but his court is as corrupt as others, some say, worse."[3] Once again the bishop failed to enlist the support of the primate. "The way to help this," Ussher replied, "is not to take away the jurisdiction of the chancellors and to put it into the bishops' hands alone. All bishops are not like my lord of Kilmore." Not indeed that the primate refused permission to his suffragan to experiment. "Your course of taking pains in keeping courts yourself I will commend, so that you condemn not them that think they have reason why they should do otherwise. . . . My chancellor is better skilled in the law than I am, and far better able to manage matters of that kind; . . . and how easy a matter it is for a bishop that is ignorant of the law to do wrong unto others and run himself into a *praemunire*; and where wrong is done, I know right may more easily be had against a chancellor than against a bishop."[4] The rejoinder of Ussher would seem pertinent and cogent; nor is it true to allege that he was indifferent to the shortcomings of his own court or the proceedings of his chancellor. Upon his succession to the primacy indeed he engaged in vigorous correspondence with the Lord Keeper in England, Bishop Williams of Lincoln, to protest against the powers claimed by Dr Ryves and embodied in his Patent as Judge of the Prerogative Court. In the course of this dispute Ussher contended for the same principles as Bedell in respect of his chancellor; namely, "that the same power should be reserved to him

[1] Ussher's *Works*, XV. Letter 161, p. 474. 23 February 1629. Ussher to Bedell.
[2] Ibid., I, p. 118.
[3] Ibid., XV. Letter 160. 15 February 1629. Bedell to Ussher.
[4] Ibid. Letter 161. 23 February 1629. Ussher to Bedell.

and his successors that the Archbishop of Canterbury retains unto himself in the office of Prerogative and Faculties"; and he protested: "Did ever any reasonable man hold it to be a thing unreasonable, that a substitute should be ordered by him that hath appointed him to be a substitute?"[1] Similarly Bedell's complaint of the harm done to his diocese by the suspension of his episcopal jurisdiction during the triennial archiepiscopal visitation of the province, would seem to have been answered adequately by Ussher. "And as for my late visiting of your diocese, your lordship need not a whit be terrified therewith. It is not to be expected that an archbishop passing through a whole province upon a sudden, should be able to perform that which a bishop may do by leisure in his every year's visitation; neither may the archbishop meddle with the reformation of anything but what is presented; if any such presentation was made and reformation of the abuse neglected, there is cause to complain of the visitation."[2]

The difference between primate and suffragan indeed was that Ussher was cautious to avoid every danger and appearance of a *praemunire* and preferred *quieta non movere*; whereas Bedell was oppressed by the ineffectiveness of the Church of Ireland in respect of the native Irish and by the inefficiency of its administration, which he sought to remedy by all means at his command, including the holding in 1638 of a Diocesan Synod to draw up twenty-two canons or regulations for the government of his diocese. On the other hand, it must be recorded to Ussher's credit, that he held visitations of his province, and on one occasion, shortly after the arrival of Lord Deputy Wentworth, during a journey into the north of Ireland, "there was offered the opportunity of solemnising the translation of the bishop of Raphoe and a consecration of the bishop of Ardagh in the cathedral church of Armagh, where no such act had been performed within the memory of any man living".[3] Yet despite these examples, it must be conceded that Ussher lacked the gifts of a successful, not to say energetic and reforming, primate. Laud indeed confessed to Wentworth in reply to his inquiry, that "I find your lordship hath a good opinion of my Lord Primate's learning and honesty, and I verily think he will not deceive your expectation in either; but you are pleased to ask me a question: whether that be all that goes to a good bishop and a good governor? I must needs answer, No; but if that which is further required be wanting in him, I am the more sorry."[4] Herein the justice of Burnet's verdict on Ussher may be readily agreed. "But no man is entirely perfect; he was not made for the governing part of his function. He had too gentle a soul to manage that rough work of reforming abuses; and, therefore, he left things as he found them. He hoped a time of reformation would come; he saw the necessity of cutting off many abuses and confessed that the tolerating those abominable corrup-

[1] Ussher's *Works*, I, pp. 70–1.
[2] Ibid., XV. Letter 161, p. 475. 23 February 1629. Ussher to Bedell.
[3] Ibid. Letter 190, p. 572. Ussher to Laud (no date).
[4] Strafford's *Letters*, I, p. 136, cited in Ussher: *Works*, I, p. 122, footnote.

tions that the Canonists had brought in, was such a stain upon a church, that in all other respects was the best reformed in the world, that he apprehended it would bring a curse and ruin upon the whole constitution. But though he prayed for a more favourable conjuncture and would have concurred in a joint reformation of these things very heartily, yet he did not bestir himself suitable to the obligations that lay on him for carrying it on."[1]

There remains, however, the most serious of all allegations against Ussher, namely, that he connived at presbyterian practices on the part of some of the suffragan-bishops of his province, which were irregular, if not indeed subversive of the episcopal constitution of the church. With the settlement of Ulster there came an influx of Scottish emigrants, and of ministers (particularly from the University of St Andrews') who secured benefices in the Church of Ireland. Two of their number became bishops: Robert Echlin of Down and Andrew Knox of Raphoe; of whom the irregularities are chiefly related. For in admitting their presbyterian-minded fellow-countrymen to an episcopally-governed church, they were alleged to have ordained them with the omission of parts of the Ordinal, and under pretence that they themselves, though bishops, participated in the imposition of hands only as co-presbyters with the other officiating ministers. In weighing this testimony, the contemporary circumstances of the Church of Scotland must be remembered. For although James I had secured in 1610 the consecration of three hitherto-titular Scottish bishops by English bishops according to the English Ordinal, they made no attempt on returning home to re-ordain their presbyterian parish ministers. Moreover, it was not until 1620 that a "Forme and Manner of Ordaining Ministers" was authorized in the Church of Scotland; before which date the two forms available had been that contained in the Book of Common Order of 1561 and the "publicke and solemne form of ordination" of 1570 which unfortunately has perished. Even as late as 1626 there were ministers admitted without episcopal ordination; and it may well have been the case, therefore, that the two offending Irish bishops exercised the same latitude in Ireland in accordance with contemporary Scottish usage, without thereby rendering their ordinations invalid from a strictly episcopalian standpoint.

The evidence of Ussher's connivance at such irregularities, however, is extremely slight. It is recorded that in conversation with one of these irregular ministers, Robert Blair, concerning his objections to the English Common Prayer Book, the primate commented that, "I perceive you'll never be satisfied therein, for still you require what ought to be done. I confess all things you except against, might, yea ought to be, removed; but that cannot be done."[2] If the matters specified related to the "nocent ceremonies", or even to other details of the liturgy, Ussher's sentiments could be paralleled from

[1] G. Burnet: *Life of William Bedell*, pp. 86–7.

[2] R. Blair: *Autobiography*, pp. 79–80. (W. Row: *The Life of Mr. Robert Blair*, containing his Autobiography from 1593–1636.)

contemporary Elizabethan and the Jacobean bishops of the Church of England; and this item is altogether insufficient for an accusation of presbyterian sympathies on his part. Furthermore, during a metropolitical visitation which he undertook in 1632, he found the diocese of Raphoe in much disorder; so that, on the death of Bishop Knox in the following year, Ussher wrote to the English Privy Council remarking "what great need that diocese hath of a bishop that is acquainted with our kind of government I found in my last year's visitation", and adding a recommendation for the filling of the see, "in which for the present there is not so much as a face seen of the government of the Church of England".[1] There is no evidence, therefore, to sustain a charge of Ussher's complicity in the irregularities prevailing in the dioceses of Down and Raphoe.

Probably the tradition of Ussher's continuing presbyterian predilections derives from the apparent contradictions of his attitude during his long residence in England from 1640 to his death in 1656. What could be made of a primate who at one time received from Charles I the revenues of the see of Carlisle and later from Cromwell an annuity of £400? Who attended Strafford on the scaffold, yet during the civil war passed freely between London and Oxford, from the headquarters of the parliamentary to those of the royalist forces? Who was invited to become a member of the Westminster Assembly and declined, yet who, when asked by Charles in the Isle of Wight: "wherever he found in antiquity that presbyters alone ordained any", replied that he "could show his majesty more, even where presbyters alone successively ordained bishops, and instanced Hierom's words *Epist: ad Evagrium*, of the presbyters of Alexandria choosing and making their own bishops from the days of Mark till Heraclus and Dionysius".[2] Perhaps a clue to the mystery is to be found in his famous project for the "Reduction of Episcopacy unto the form of Synodical Government received in the Ancient Church"; in which, after providing for a parochial committee of the incumbent, church wardens and sidesmen to oversee the life and conversation of the people, he proposed the association of presbyters with the bishop at each of the levels of rural deanery, diocese and province, culminating in a national synod. By this means he hoped to retain what he believed to be essential to episcopacy as practised in the early Church and to combine with it the essence of presbyterianism. Nor should it be forgotten that after the Restoration the saintly Scottish Bishop Robert Leighton strove to translate Ussher's precepts into practice in his dioceses of Dunblane and Glasgow.

In truth Ussher had a cross-bench mind, appreciating the standpoint of both sides in an age of fierce ecclesiastical controversy, and seeking so long as the possibility remained for accommodation and comprehension. To the end of his Irish career he retained evident traces of his early convictions. After a visit to him at Drogheda, Strafford observed with astonishment to Laud that he found "not so

[1] Ussher: *Works*, XVI. Letter 416, pp. 510–11 (n.d.).
[2] M. Sylvester: *Reliquiae Baxterianae*. Liber I, part ii, § 63, p. 206 (1696 edition).

much as a communion table in the chapel, which seemed to me strange; no bowing there I warrant you". To which Laud replied, concurring in the "wonder that the chapel should never have a communion table in it, save that I know some divines are of opinion that nothing belonging to that Sacrament is aught *extra usum*, and do therefore set the table aside in any corner (good enough for it) save only at the time of administration".[1] Evidently standards of churchmanship differed considerably between Canterbury and Armagh. In England, however, Ussher was reckoned amongst the Canterburian faction by that inveterate enemy of prelacy, William Prynne. "The very best and learnedest of all the whole pack of prelates, even the Primate of Armagh, Bishop Ussher, of whom most men have hitherto had a very honourable opinion (though a great servant and instrument of Canterburies in Ireland, as appears by sundry original letters to him under his own hand), hath extremely degenerated in his Christian zeal for the Protestant religion, even in his own bleeding country, since he turned royalist and cavalier."[2] In theological doctrine indeed the combined testimony of Brian Walton, Peter Gunning and Herbert Thorndike agreed, that Ussher during his sojourn in England declared "his utter dislike of the doctrine of absolute reprobation and held the universality of Christ's death, and that not only in respect of sufficiency but also in regard of efficacy, so that all men were thereby salveable".[3] In respect of church polity it may be suggested that his first-hand experience of the development of the ecclesiastical situation in England, from the Westminster Assembly to the Cromwellian experiment of a congeries of sects united by *force majeure* into the external semblance of a church, convinced him of the value of episcopacy as the visible embodiment of continuity and an essential bond of union. Had he lived until the Restoration he might have been as staunch a defender of its ecclesiastical settlement with its stronger emphasis on episcopacy as Bramhall; and like him, whilst holding of the foreign Reformed churches that "I have ever declared my opinion to be that *Episcopus et Presbyter gradu tantum differunt, non ordine*, and consequently that in places where Bishops cannot be had, the ordination of Presbyters standeth valid; yet on the other side, holding as I do, that a Bishop hath superiority in degree over a Presbyter, . . . the ordination made by such Presbyters as have severed themselves from those Bishops unto whom they had sworn canonical obedience, cannot possibly by me be excused from being schismatical".[4]

If Ussher's greatest renown lies undoubtedly in his work as a scholar, the relationship between scholarship and churchmanship was so intimate that the glory of the one must needs cast its reflection on the other. It was upon the foundation of his patristic and biblical learning that the superstructure of his churchmanship was built. He was a man of equal and exemplary industry and piety; an

[1] Ussher: *Works*, I, pp. 200–1.
[2] W. Prynne: *A Complete History of the Trial and Condemnation of Laud.* Dedicatory Epistle, p. 13.
[3] Ussher: *Works*, I, pp. 292–4.
[4] Ibid., pp. 258–9.

earnest and persuasive preacher; especially diligent in the solemn work of ordination and in the practical rules given to his ordinands for the discharge of their office as pastors and teachers; and as primate he sought to maintain the relative independence of the Church of Ireland in regard to its sister church in England, though always in the interest of the Anglo-Irish. In his successful efforts to frame for the Church of Ireland its own Canons Ecclesiastical, instead of adopting those of England without change, Strafford observed of him that "the business is merely a point of honour (or as Sir Thomas Cognesby would have expressed it, a matter of punctilio) lest Ireland might become subject to the Church of England, as the Province of York is to that of Canterbury. Needs forsooth we must be a Church of ourselves, which is utterly lost unless the Canons here differ, albeit not in substance yet in some form, from yours in England; and this crotchet put the good man into such an agony, as you cannot believe so learned a man should be troubled withal. . . . The truth is, I conceive there are some Puritan correspondents of his, that infuse these necessities into his head, besides a popular disposition, which inclines him to a desire of pleasing all, the sure way I think never to please a man's self."[1]

It must be granted, however, that the scholar in Ussher militated against the success of the ecclesiastical administrator. His frequent and sometimes prolonged absences in England in search of manuscripts and books for his learned works prevented him from giving an undivided attention to the complex of problems pressing upon the primate of All Ireland. Once more the verdict of Burnet may be echoed: "He was not made for the governing part of his function . . . And those that upon all other accounts loved and admired him, lamented this defect in him; which was the only allay that seemed left, and without which he would have been held perhaps in more veneration than was fitting. His physician, Dr Bootius, that was a Dutchman, said truly of him, 'If our Primate of Armagh were as exact a disciplinarian, as he is eminent in searching antiquity, defending the truth and preaching the Gospel, he might without doubt deserve to be made the chief Churchman of Christendom.' "[2] When Bishop Ralph Brownrigg of Exeter heard of Ussher's death, he wrote to William Sancroft, "My Lord Primate's death is a great grief to me. I hear from Dean Bernard that he died of a pleurisy: —that sickness being unto him as the angel that smote St Peter on the side, and enlarged him out of prison and set him at liberty. I Pray God the loss of him is not ominous to us; when such jewels are made up, it argues God is removing from us."[3] If Ussher was hardly to be described without exaggeration as "the chief Churchman of Christendom", Dr Johnson erred little, if at all, in calling him "the great luminary of the Irish church". Far from the realization of Bishop Brownrigg's

[1] Ussher: *Works*, I, p. 178; citing Strafford: Letters, i, 381.
[2] G. Burnet: *Life of William Bedell*, pp. 87–8.
[3] C. McNeill: *The Tanner Letters. Original Documents and Notices of Irish affairs in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, extracted from the collection in the Bodlein Library, Oxford.* (Irish MS. Commission, 1943), p. 389.

dismal fear that his death signified the removal of the candlestick of the Irish Church, his fame shines even more brightly on this tercentenary of his death. So long as Ussher's College and Church can produce churchmen of his pattern, their candle will be set high upon a candlestick *ut luceat omnibus qui in domo sunt.*

NORMAN SYKES.

(*Concluded*)

Letter from South India

IN my last letter (THEOLOGY, March 1955) I wrote mainly about the gospel sacraments. Now I will turn to the ministry of bishops, presbyters, deacons and lay people. *Honoris causa* let us begin with the bishops.

When first I encountered a C.S.I. bishop on his home ground, I knew him for what he was by his wooden pectoral cross. But I must confess that I was misled at a distance by his moustache (sans beard). To my disordered fancy (I had just driven two hundred miles over indifferent roads with a three weeks' old baby among the passengers) these distinguishing features appeared symbolic; the wooden cross, of our adherence in C.S.I. to the historic tradition of episcopacy (yet without gilded prelacy!) so that our bishops are readily recognizable as such; the moustache, of a certain freedom which the union of episcopal with non-episcopal churches brings from any slavish adherence to the details of any "denominational" pattern of episcopacy, Roman, Anglican or any other.

Later I accompanied this particular bishop on a short tour. I could observe how he sought to encourage and guide the pastors we visited —work not dissimilar to that to which he was accustomed before union, as a Methodist district missionary. But what an accession of authority in the Spirit the office of bishop does bring! Central to the objects of the tour was the confirmation service at a strategic centre. In his address the bishop was at pains to expound the meaning of confirmation and exhort the people to give it its rightful place in the life of the local church. Nor were our attentions confined to the Christians. There were evangelistic meetings in the cattle market. And the bishop found time to captain a scratch cricket team which challenged the town team on Republic Day, and gave a good account of itself to the tune of two hundred or so for five in a couple of gruelling hours.

Since then I have of course had many opportunities of seeing our own bishop at work. As a near neighbour, I have several times had the joy of sharing in the daily family worship at the chapel attached to his house. There all the pastors in the diocese and all the dioceses in the church are regularly remembered in prayer. Annually I have arranged for our confirmation candidates to meet him, according to his custom, for a full day of retreat on the eve of confirmation. There is nothing unusual in a bishop praying for the clergy and the church.

I suppose they all do it. But does the Anglican set-up, with its huge industrial dioceses, permit the bishops to give such individual attention to confirmation candidates? Perhaps in some cases.

It may not be fortuitous that confirmation has figured prominently in this brief glance at our bishops at work. For confirmation is gaining ground on its own merits, and our own confirmation service is in regular use. In the dioceses already referred to, the bishops (Methodist-plus and Anglican-plus respectively) are the regular ministers of confirmation. And some readers will remember how a village confirmation conducted by the Presbyterian-plus bishop in Madurai was chosen as the climax for the C.M.S. film "South Indian Journey".

But let us turn to the presbyters; and first to their training. For it is for this work in particular that one or two readers may be potential recruits! I have had good opportunities of observing the work of the United Theological College, Bangalore, and the Tamilnad Theological College, Tirumaraiyur. The emphasis of the former is academic, its medium of instruction English. Four Anglicans-plus, including three from the British Isles, are on its staff. Tirumaraiyur, on the other hand, where the medium of instruction is Tamil, is planned, as its name implies, as a village whose members are trained primarily for the village ministry, with a marked emphasis on the theory and practice of worship and evangelism in village conditions. This is not to deny of course the academic aspirations of Tirumaraiyur or Bangalore's concern for evangelism and worship! There are also vernacular colleges for the Malayal and Cannarese speaking areas, approximately analogous to Tirumaraiyur.

Despite this adequate provision for their training, ordination candidates are not coming forward as they should. In our diocese some twenty pastorates are vacant; and in the church as a whole a pastor may be in charge of up to fifty villages. The call to ordination is hardly being sounded in our impressive network of Christian homes, schools and colleges. In this crisis tentative plans are being put into practice for the establishment of a voluntary part-time village presbyterate, not negatively as a mere remedy, but as a positive factor in a more effective pattern of ministry. My own colleague at the English-speaking church at Palamcottah, though ordained as presbyter, continues as a doctor in practice. In Madurai Diocese there is a more systematic development. With the permission of the C.S.I. Synod, one pastorate has been chosen for a responsible experiment. A mass movement has been going on in the area for the last ten years, almost entirely as a result of voluntary work by the local village Christians. Six of the best of these men have been chosen as candidates for ordination. They are day-labourers, small farmers. One is a teacher, one a skilful drummer. They are proved instruments of God in evangelism. Their training consists of nine ten-day periods spaced over three years of residential study in one of the villages, living in community with their wives and children. For the rest of the year they are in pastoral charge of congregations under the direction of the local presbyter, receiving constant practical training in pastoral work, preaching and the conduct of worship. They and their wives are also

helped to improve their general literacy. But their training is devised to ensure that they do not lose the character of villagers.

I owe this information to Bishop Newbigin, bishop in Madurai. He has also told me of an attempt to establish a genuine diaconate to serve the big city churches. Two senior educationists have been made deacon and assigned to particular congregations for pastoral work and the conduct of worship. They continue in their teaching work. Only men who are able and willing to work anywhere in the diocese according as they are assigned will be ordained presbyter; a measure to discourage men coming in for the sake of the personal prestige it might bring, and to safeguard the special character of the diaconate.

But this is a small beginning. The whole question of the diaconate is being raised in South India. The threefold ministry has been accepted in principle and in practice. But its meaning is being examined. In particular the question is being asked: "What is a deacon?" It has to be admitted that (for example) the admirable symposium on the subject in THEOLOGY (November 1955) did not make some of us much clearer on this point. It is of course widely agreed that the diaconate as a mere step to the presbyterate will not do. And I understand that the question has been asked in our Theological Commissions: "Would the abandonment of the rule that persons to be ordained presbyters should first be made deacons involve the loss of anything essential to the fullness of catholicity, and if so how and why?" There may be correspondents to THEOLOGY who would like to try their hand unofficially at that one!

Much that has been said implies the need for a lively exercise of the ministry of the laity in all its manifold grace. Our constitution is devised to relieve the bishop of some of his traditional executive authority and administrative responsibility. But this doesn't altogether work out in practice. For instance, he may well find himself manager of all the diocesan schools; a job that a responsible layman ought to be doing. The shortage of presbyters is partly remedied by an army of village teacher-catechists, paid as teachers by the government. Many of them are devoted men. But the church may already be paying in spiritual terms for this system whereby she gets a good part of her village ministry at government expense from men whose primary vocation may not be to the ministry nor even to teaching.

It should be made clear that this is a personal view of the matter, and I repeat that many teacher-catechists are doing excellent work. Beside them march an army of Bible women and other whole- or part-time church workers. Our Women's Order plays a distinctive part at a high level, though the numbers are comparatively small. Many teachers in Christian schools and colleges find a real vocation in their work; often enough having originally come to it only after failure to secure a more lucrative post in government service. Doctors and lawyers too—though it is often significantly difficult to fill medical posts in remote mission hospitals. There are various attempts to give biblical and theological training to these workers. U.T.C., Bangalore, runs a year's course for laymen; though few indeed are the lay folk who can take a year off from their work. The

Christian Educational Council conducts examinations for a diploma in religious knowledge, primarily for teachers. Valuing some papers for them on one occasion, I recognized the handwriting of a fellow-missionary! The Council also subsidizes an annual Bible School primarily for college lecturers. Much more is being done. And there is much more to be said. For instance, it would hardly be proper to write a letter from South India without some reference to Travancore and its remarkable people. But, to quote from my previous letter, I can only "write personally, seeking to open a window from within".

A. H. Dammers.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Mrs J. S. F. Parker is Organizing Secretary of the Speakers' Department of the Mothers' Union.

Mr Munby is a Lecturer in Economics at King's College, Aberdeen.

Dr Simms has lately been translated from the Bishopric of Cork to the Archbishopric of Dublin.

Dr Sykes is Dixie Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Cambridge.

The Rev. A. H. Dammers is Chaplain and Lecturer in English at St John's College, Palamcottah.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE MINISTRY OF HEALING

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

Dr Waterson's article on "Faith Healing and Faith Healers" seems to show a certain confusion of thought. In his earlier sections, which are admirable, he deals with the cult of faith healing as practised by individual "healers", with the typical theology of such people, and the important factor of their personality. As, however, he goes on to his section on "The Dangers Inherent in Faith Healing" he seems to overlook his own earlier remark, "The terms spiritual healing and divine healing are being used to-day in many different senses", and concludes with a summing-up which is critical not only of the cult of "faith healing" but also, by implication, of very different aspects of healing, more associated with what is truly the Church's Ministry of Healing than with the work of individual "healers". The reason for this change of subject seems to be that he bases this last section not upon his study of "healers", their theology and their personality, but upon his own theology of disease and suffering, and that theology is not above criticism.

It is true, as he says, that the Bible sees disease and suffering against the background of eternity, connected in its origin with the Fall, that it presents a God as ready to discipline his children in

affliction as he is to support them in the trial of their faith which that affliction brings, and that it sees a consummation when suffering shall be no more. But while it is true it is too vague and begs too many questions.

The Bible as a whole says many things about disease; it says that it is divine punishment for sin and that the cure is to be found in repentance: it says, too, that disease is a result of the Fall and suggests that release will be found in paradise regained. But to get away from these contradictions we have to ask not "what the Bible says", but "what Christ says", and we cannot afford to gloss over, as Dr Waterson does, the fact that Jesus Christ, by words, by deeds, and by the amount of time he spent healing the sick, treated disease as one of the great enemies of God and man; an enemy, moreover, to be conquered not in the remote hereafter but now.

It seems that Dr Waterson, at least in respect of disease, clings to a futurist eschatology now happily dead. The assumption that almost every benefit won by the Incarnation is not to be apprehended until a final consummation has fashioned theologians' attitude to disease for centuries, and is reflected in the Prayer Book Office for the Visitation of the Sick, in which, if we do not actually tell the sufferer that he must have deserved it, we try to console him with the thought that he will just have to put up with it, and make the best of it by the grace of God.

Christ showed us plainly that disease has no place in the Kingdom of God. Granted in one sense the Kingdom is still to come—unchallenged, in all the fullness of its power. But in another, and in a very true sense, the Kingdom is here now, it has been here since the King came with his Gospel of Redemption, of rescue from every evil force, and not from sin alone. We are familiar with the fact that the Gospel offers us rescue from the power of sin now; freedom from the condemnation of sin, and grace to overcome the shortcomings of a sin-weakened nature; and that fellowship with God and eternal life is ours, here and now. We know that death, apart from the physical fact of it, is already conquered, and we find nothing strange in the truth that in the fellowship of the Church redeemed mankind is already being rebuilt. Why should it seem, for theological reasons, that the conquest of one enemy alone, disease, must necessarily be postponed until a far-off consummation?

This is not to say that all suffering is an enemy of God, and conquered already. It cannot be, for suffering is an inevitable condition of the life, in an unredeemed world, of the redeemed children of the Kingdom. Consequently it is true that "God is as ready to discipline his children in affliction as he is to support them in the trial of their faith" which it brings. But that does not mean that this is all that God is prepared to do in the case of the suffering which is caused by disease, for there is a very important distinction between suffering in general and disease in particular. Dr Waterson overlooks this distinction when he bases his argument on his use of the terms as if they were synonymous. A man "suffering for Christ" is whole in a way he may not have been before he had to make up his mind

and take his stand: a man suffering from a physical defect is not whole.

The common assumption that a spiritual "wholeness" makes unnecessary any theological concern with a physical defectiveness shows an equally common failure to appreciate the sacramental meaning of the physical creation, for our bodies no less than our spirits were made to reflect the glory of God. A man suffering from cancer can indeed reflect the glory of God in his spirit, in spite of his disease, but his body cannot: the condition of that body is an injury and a grief to the God who made it to reflect his perfection. To say that God's answer to suffering is the Cross is true, but it does not follow that God's will is not to cure disease. Through the Cross indeed comes God's answer to disease. But while the Cross gives us the power to transform suffering, even the suffering of disease, it does not show us that disease itself is to be accepted as our lot, and suffered for the whole of our earthly existence. Truly it reminds us that "God himself is no stranger to suffering and . . . is a pledge of God's final triumph over the very artificer of suffering", but it in no way teaches us that God's triumph over disease itself cannot be an immediate one. Dr Waterson's argument to that end would be valid only if the Cross had been a sick-bed.

It is strange that the truth, basic to any ministry of healing in the Church, that God is concerned not only with the state of our souls but also with the state of our bodies, is not always recognized as being also basic to the ministry of medical science. Yet if God's will with regard to disease is simply to give us, through the Cross, the power to bear and transcend it, then the doctor is simply wasting his time, for he can have little hope of improving upon the will of God.

Of course we must guard against the danger of "healing becoming another gospel". That is one of the obvious dangers of the "faith healing" cult. Though it does not at first appear to be so, that tendency is seated in the medieval, and still deep-rooted, attempt to separate the so-called "spiritual" from the so-called "physical". The faith healer attempts to cure the physical by spiritual means, but he overlooks the fact that there are other and more serious ills to cure: he is prepared to say "take up thy bed and walk" without the other and deeper half of the healing: he tries to cure the disease, not to heal the man. On the other hand, Dr Waterson's mistake, rooted in the same dichotomy between spiritual and physical, is in his apparent attempt to split the man into two by asking two individuals to heal the separate halves—which are not separate at all. Recently a consultant physician said to me: "You minister to souls and I minister to bodies." In reply to the question, "Can you really separate soul and body like that?" he agreed, "Well no, you can't; we both look after the same one person from different sides." The belief that the Gospel has something to give to the whole man, spirit and body, in no way leads to trespass on the doctor's ground. Their approach is to the same one man, from different sides, but not to separate halves of the man.

The Church's ministry to the sick, as I see it, does not involve the

minister in dangerous amateur doctoring or psychology. It consists of preaching the Gospel of God's love and God's saving act in Christ in a way that not only makes it more real—and most people in this country have a conception of God more calculated to make them die of fright than to aid their recovery—but also in a way that shows it to be relevant to their present need and circumstances. It includes, indeed, the attempt to show them a power that can transform their sufferings, but it must not stop at that: it must go on to awaken the conviction that God not only cares, but also wills to do something about it. It aims to awaken and make real the faith that the Jesus who went about not only making people good but also making them whole is present within them by his Holy Spirit, and present more and more as they will receive him. It includes the reminder that the doctor is God's minister as much as any parson, and that the power of God is at work through him. It involves training in the prayer of faith, as contrasted with the cry of desperation, but it does not involve making cruel and foolish promises. If the laying-on-of-hands or anointing is part of the ministry this is only after a long preparation which ensures that it will not be mistaken for a magical piece of quack doctoring, but will be understood as a sacramental means of bringing God's power to the person. Such a ministry has no place for "miracles", any more than the Holy Communion is miraculous; it expects no fantastic results to astound and ridicule the family doctor. In fact, providing that the doctor is giving the right treatment and working by the grace of God, one might say that the ideal result is that the patient should respond naturally and completely to the doctor's treatment.

It seems a pity that in an article specifically on "Faith Healing and Faith Healers" Dr Waterson should have attacked, even by accident, the theological ground for belief in such a different ministry.

Yours faithfully,
G. O. Needham.

Wrenbury Vicarage,
Nantwich, Cheshire.

THE DOCTRINE OF INTENTION

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

I hope I shall not be wasting your valuable space if I join friendly issue again with Mr Michael Bruce on this teasing question of intention. I do not agree that repudiation by a priest of his ministry is any indication, in itself, of a lack of intention to do what the Church does. With us a priest may obtain laicization by canonical process, and thus cease to will to celebrate Mass or function in other ways as a priest. Yet he can continue to frequent the Sacraments as a layman.

Such a priest would be fully justified in emergency in absolving a dying man, and in doing so would be perfectly capable of intending to do what the Church does; as indeed he would even if he had lost

all faith. Moreover, a time might come when he would wish to return to the exercise of his priesthood, repudiate his laicization and resume his saying of Mass. This would be possible provided authority were to grant the necessary faculties.

I agree entirely with Mr Bruce that intention is more closely connected with obedience and the will than with understanding and belief. The minimum ministerial intention necessary in any Sacrament is an act of the will to do what the Church does. It need be accompanied neither by understanding of nor belief in the Church or the sacred action performed in its name. If, however, the act of the will positively excludes from the action an element known to be held by the Church (however understood) as essential, it does not appear unreasonable to doubt the validity of what is done since the minister is clearly then not performing it as an action held sacred by the Church. I agree, however, with Mr Bruce that there will often be room for doubt concerning the nature of the exclusion and what it actually excludes. But in such cases it is the business of the canonist to play for safety in his rulings.

And surely your other correspondents on this subject, J. H. J. Westlake and Timothy Ware, who express anxiety about the Orders of the C.S.I. are confusing ministerial intention with the meaning of the rite used in ordaining. What individual bishops of the C.S.I. may think or believe concerning the sacrament of order and the nature of the priesthood and episcopate is of no moment, as far as validity is concerned, so long as their innner intention is an obedient act of the will implementing what the Church (of South India) does. What *is* of moment in this matter is the mind of the C.S.I. as a body corporate, claiming the right to ordain and consecrate by formulae of its own choosing, concerning episcopate and priesthood, and whether that mind is embodied in the newly constructed forms it uses. For the conferring of a sacrament is an exercise of the authority of Christ, and for a valid exercise of that authority the forms must express the mind of Christ as it is, not merely as it is conceived to be by those who use them.

Yours faithfully,
HENRY ST JOHN, O.P.

HAWKESYARD PRIORY,
RUGELEY, STAFFS.
3 *January* 1957.

PARISH NEWSPAPERS

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

No doubt like many other readers, I was extremely grateful for Mr Stacey's important article on parish newspapers. There is one small error to which I would draw attention. The pioneer in this

field was not the Rev. Edwin Young in 1948, for in 1946 there came into my hands an issue of the *Kentish Town Church Times* whose editor was, and probably still is, the Rev. A. E. L. Bush.

Yours faithfully,

St Aidan's College,
Birkenhead.

Michael Hennell.

AN ENGLISHMAN IN WALES

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

In your January number (p. 25) Professor Fuller, in his review of the Reverend Geraint Vaughan Jones's book, *Christology and Myth in the New Testament*, says: "As a mere Saesneg I cannot forebear to point out that the Welsh theological term for salvation is *iachawdwriaeth* and not *iechydwriaeth*." It may perhaps be allowable to add that there does not, according to the experts, appear to be any distinction, theological or other, between the two Welsh words quoted by Professor Fuller (whose interest as a Sais—an Englishman: Saesneg=English—in Welsh matters might serve as an example to those clergy in Wales who seem to care less than he for a language used in services throughout the Province). Both words have long been in use, with a similar connotation: some thirty years ago *iechydwriaeth* was more favoured by some pundits, but by to-day the form *iachawdwriaeth* is preferred. For practical purposes, however, the two are interchangeable.

Yours faithfully,
T. I. Ellis.

Aberystwyth.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Messianic Idea in Israel. By Joseph Klausner. George Allen and Unwin. 30s.

The Messiah in the Old Testament. By Helmer Ringgren. S.C.M. Press. 7s. 6d.

Dr Klausner's book is a work of high value likely to keep its honoured place for many decades to come. First impressions arouse disappointment. It is essentially an old work. The first part, tracing the Messianic idea through the Hebrew Scriptures was first written in 1903 and 1907–8; the second part, dealing with the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, in 1921; and the third part, on the period of the Tannaim, is the fruit of a doctoral dissertation published in German in 1902. These were first published together as a single book in Hebrew in 1927. The primary purpose of this publication may be expressed in the author's own words: "I wish to give, in the Hebrew language, a complete picture of the development of the Messianic idea *from its beginning to the present time*." The present volume is

a translation of the third edition of 1949, in which the claim is made to have taken recent work into account. The cause of disappointment is not that the basis of this volume is old but that the revision of it does not fulfil its claim to be abreast of all important new contributions. Mowinckel receives no mention, and the whole approach to the Messiahship through the idea of kingship as exemplified in some psalms passes unnoticed. As a result, Moses has to serve as the sole prototype of the expected Messiah and his political-spiritual rôle is regarded as the source of the dualism to be found in later Messianic hopes. Many will judge this to be a totally inadequate account of the beginnings of the Messianic idea. Recent work on the idea of the Son of Man might not exist. The interpretation of the psalms is wrecked from the start by a hopelessly outdated critical approach to them. It is incredible that a 1956 publication should comment: "Most modern scholars conclude that it (i.e. the Psalter) contains no hymn earlier than the Babylonian exile" (p. 140). The Messianic teaching of the Qumram sect receives only passing notice in footnotes. Furthermore, while the author knows and quotes freely the earlier generation of scholars like Duhm, Marti, and Budde, he largely ignores their successors. Albright's *From the Stone Age to Christianity* seems to serve for most of them. It is mainly modern Jewish scholars writing in Hebrew to whom the author turns.

This narrows the appeal of the volume. Yet disappointment gives way to admiration and delight. For from beginning to end this is the fresh, independent work of a true scholar who loves the subject of his work more than any other and whose deep feeling and insight into its many problems is manifest on every page. And the greater part of what he writes stands independent of the limitations to which we have drawn attention; it is the fruit of a deep and vast knowledge of the relevant Jewish writings.

He begins from the Jewish presupposition that it is possible to have Messianic hopes without a Messiah. The scope of his treatment is therefore wider than that of Mowinckel who, in his *He that Cometh,* is concerned mainly with the figure of Messiah himself. Few Christian scholars will complain since the Jewish writings within and without Scripture must be allowed some independent status of their own. Indeed, the reader of Klausner may be inclined to ask whether Mowinckel has not unduly narrowed his definitions. However that may be, the general ideas which are the subject of this book are a *datum* calling for analysis and description. Both the more precise concern of Mowinckel and the wider story told by Klausner are essential to the Old Testament, whatever disagreement there may be on the relation of messianic ideas to eschatological hopes or on the distinction between the Messianic Age and the World-to-Come. They may be regarded as complementary, the one filling up that which is lacking in the other.

Every book with which Klausner deals is critically introduced. Here, except in the case of the psalms, the author's cautious, scientific spirit is a remarkable anticipation of the less radical spirit which marks the world of Old Testament scholarship to-day. It is this

scientific approach which enables him not only to set the Messianic idea in its historical development but also to demonstrate the cross-fertilization of idea and historical crisis. Here is perhaps Klausner's most original contribution, particularly in the field of the Tannaitic literature where the influence of history might at first sight seem to be least important. He writes consistently and convincingly to the thesis that "Jewish history alone is the true key to the Jewish Messianic Idea". It is particularly valuable to have the third and already most influential part of the work in English for the first time.

The translation is on the whole excellent and the accuracy of printing seems phenomenal—worthy of this great and impressive preoccupation of a long life dedicated to the study of the deepest springs of Zionism.

Helmer Ringgren's book is an attempt to show how the most modern biblical research may help the Church to interpret the traditional Messianic passages of the Old Testament with a new appreciation of their traditional, Messianic meaning. To this end he expounds first, the relevant "royal psalms"; second, the principal passages about Messiah in Isaiah, Micah, Jeremiah, and Zechariah; third, the "servant songs"; and fourth, certain psalms which are sometimes called the "servant psalms".

Certainly the *results* of much contemporary (mainly Scandinavian) work are here conveniently presented to the English reader. The book is however so short that it defeats its purpose. The kind of reader for whom this sort of exposition is new will find no guidance as to how it is related to previous work or how it is a new departure. And the reader for whom it is not new will be oppressed by the weakness of the argument. For example, the attempt to bring all the "servant songs" within the same framework by pointing to royal categories in each does not carry conviction, particularly in the second and third songs. Psalm 116 can be interpreted with almost complete adequacy on simpler lines. The lack of cogency is sometimes concealed behind ambiguous generalities. Of Psalm 22 the author writes: "Nothing proves that the speaker is a king, but, on the other hand, there is nothing to exclude the possibility of his being so." Precisely so. There is much which is not more inherently convincing. The chain of the argument is not strengthened by assembling a good number of links when so many of the links are weak!

Yet the book may serve to open the eyes of many to the *possibilities* which lie in some recent movements of Old Testament study.

DURHAM. DOUGLAS R. JONES.

THE TEN COMMANDMENTS. By Solomon Goldman. Edited and with an introduction by Maurice Samuel. University of Chicago Press and Cambridge University Press. 28s.

It is very good for us to make contact with a Jewish mind. It aims at an orthodoxy of obedience rather than at an orthodoxy of opinion

or of faith. So, while able to move in any sphere of thought, it remains practical and always sticks to, or returns to, the point. We find our prejudices refuted and our assumptions challenged. But we also find that frequently the same conclusions have been reached by different roads.

This is the first posthumous work of Rabbi Goldman's to be published. He, the author of *The Book of Books*, had long been at work at a commentary on the Bible, and had just dealt with Exodus 19 and 20 before he died. It is a first draught, with eighteen pages of bibliography and innumerable quotations from every imaginable and many an unexpected source. It ought to be most indigestible and unreadable—but that is exactly what it is not! For my part I devoured it in a single gulp, and now, as I read again more slowly, I see with what literary skill and style it has been presented.

In Goldman's pithy phrase "theory is more often the father of fact than its offspring". Recent archaeological discoveries demand that we should reconsider our theories. But dogmatic presuppositions (liberal or anti-liberal) vitiate many if not all attempts at restatement! Goldman is unaffected by our theological controversies, and can give us something like an unbiased statement of what the data and the findings ought to be. He discards the evolutionary theories and confident reconstructions of Wellhausen and his school, but does not say goodbye to JEPD and all that. He insists that we know little of Hebrew origins. Yet we do know enough to see that "the earliest biblical narrators had at their disposal history as well as legend" and to take their account seriously, if not always uncritically. "Moses ought not to be denied the authorship of a compendium of prohibitions most of which had existed in Near Eastern codes of law centuries before he was born." Yet amid general probabilities we must not rule out the unique and creative appearance of a new thing. "Not to covet was as heterodox, singular and unimaginable an idea as an imageless God, or day of rest for freeman, beast and slave alike." A redeemed and freed people could alone fulfil such laws—and in them and in the Exodus God reveals himself as Redeemer, not only as Creator.

Here we find a doctrine of grace that is almost Augustinian! "The humble-minded Pharisees commented that our deeds were not meritorious of God's grace, and if he did show kindness to us, it was because from the very beginning he had created the world with *hesed*." We see that Jews are rediscovering the breadth and depth of such doctrines, and are not afraid to study the New Testament. Rabbi Goldman can illustrate such doctrines we had thought our peculiar possession by quotations from Jewish sources, and can make some sharp replies to critics of Judaism.

The commentary consists mostly of quotations. The Rabbinic ones are often fantastic in their subtle shrewd way, and at the same time superb. But we often hear also Origen or Matthew Henry, or other Christians new and old. Hebrew piety, murmuring over and learning by heart the sacred words, can often extract new light from them, and drop such a word as this: "At the second commandment

a Hebrew monosyllable LCHA spells volumes. 'Make not an image', it says, 'to be in any way related to you or a part of you, to be anything more than the inanimate and inert thing it is'."

We come on one strange circumlocution, "the second millennium before the common era", and are puzzled until we realize it has been done to avoid using a certain title—but the person referred to is mentioned by name later on.

C. W. Quin.

St John's, Cork.

The Philosophy of the Church Fathers. Vol. I. By Harry Austryn Wolfson. Harvard University Press. London: Cumberlege. 80s.

The first of Professor Wolfson's two volumes on patristic philosophy by itself runs to over 600 pages, and the whole work is intended as a sequel to the two volumes of similar compass which he has already published on Philo. An author who would demand of his readers "so large a portion of so short an existence" (as Macaulay complained of an earlier display of prolixity) must show himself master of the entire range of his material. Professor Wolfson's range is certainly vast (it extends to the Sixth General Council and the writings of St John of Damascus), and there is no disputing his profound familiarity with the whole field of Hellenistic philosophy. Those who come to him for information on the early Alexandrians, Gnosticism, the shifting meanings of *ousia* and *hypostasis* in the development of Trinitarian doctrine, or the Aristotelian theory of physical union which was applied to the union of Godhead and manhood in Christ, will find him a comprehensive and instructive, if pedestrian, guide. But because the Fathers are fundamentally not speculative philosophers but Christian theologians working with the philosophical apparatus of their day, it is impracticable to give an account of their philosophy in isolation without getting under their theological skin. Professor Wolfson does not shirk the theological issues; it does not appear that he has sufficiently mastered them.

Thus we find him equating faith in Augustine (of all people) with the Stoic's assent to a reasonable probability—without a hint that Augustine uses human analogies to describe something on an entirely different level. Again, to summarize orthodox Christology baldly as the "attempt to combine two contradictory conceptions of Jesus, the Jewish and the pagan, or the Ebionitic and the Docetic" is to miss both the underlying paradox of the Christian faith and the soteriological interest of its defenders. Nor will his paragraph on the *Filioque* dispute commend itself either to the defenders or the challengers of that doctrine.

But nowhere is this want of a true theological dimension more apparent than in Professor Wolfson's treatment of the New Testament. The objections to this are, first, that he sees it, as so much else, through Philonic spectacles; not only is John assumed without argument to owe his Logos-doctrine to Philo, but the apostle Paul him-

self is presented, especially in his attitude to the interpretation of Scripture, as a Christian counterpart, if not ape, of that philosopher. Secondly, that much in recent, and post-liberal, New Testament scholarship has passed him by; otherwise he could not so readily have credited the same Paul with the discovery of a "new meaning" in the gospel sacraments (or with a "rebuke" to the *Ephesian* Christians), nor in his analysis of non-literal interpretations of Scripture distinguished the "adventual" from the "eschatological". Thirdly, and most serious, that some of his arguments are strangely *naïve*, particularly those by which he claims to establish his own theory that in Pauline theology the Holy Spirit is to be identified with the pre-existent Christ. He arrives at this by interpreting Rom. 8. 32 of Jesus and then arguing that the sonship referred to there must in his case be the same as the sonship in, e.g., Col. 1. 13 ff.; which is possible only if the pre-existent Son is identified with the Spirit which "led" Jesus. He finds support ("proof", he says) for this position in the fact that the rock which in 1 Cor. 10. 4 is identified with the (pre-existent) Christ is there called "spiritual" and therefore "cannot but mean 'Spirit' or 'Holy Spirit'"! He concludes that the Pauline Trinity consists of "God, the Holy Spirit, and the glorified body of Jesus", and that it was this which gave rise to the Matthaean and Lucan birth narratives; and here he attempts to read the pre-Nicene Fathers' use of *pneuma* to denote the divine element in the incarnate Christ back into such passages as Matt. 1. 19 and Luke 1. 35, where it clearly does not belong. Few readers, again, will join him in finding his "Pauline Trinity" in the Trinitarian references and doxologies of the Apostolic Fathers; and the constant reminders of this precarious hypothesis, as if it were firmly established, which recur throughout the book, do not enhance its claim to rank as a work of authoritative scholarship.

Finally, despite the widening gap between English and American usage, it is hard to believe that the currency of either is improved by such doubtful coinages as "godhood", "clericity", and "consentaneous". Of some inept translations, the rendering of ἐπαγγελίας τέκνα in Gal. 4. 28 as "children of praise" is perhaps the most memorable. And the high standard of book production and typography which we have learned to expect from American universities deserved better service from the proof-reader; no fewer than thirty misprints have been noted.

Humphrey Green.

King's College,
London.

The Indian Christians of St Thomas. By L. W. Brown. Cambridge University Press. 40s.

The Bishop of Uganda is thoroughly qualified to write this timely book. He went to Travancore in 1938 and became Principal of the Theological College in Trivandrum. Unlike many who have written about the Thomas Christians, he shows no obvious bias or polemical

purpose, but writes in the finest tradition of English historical scholarship and, what is very important, has an excellent knowledge of the local language, Malayalam. The book is beautifully produced with illustrations, index, and a very full bibliography and glossary. It is unfortunate though perhaps inevitable that the book should be so costly.

The author speaks of the need for "a fresh investigation of the history of the Malabar Church . . . sympathetic and, in the assessment of responsibility for schism, as impartial as possible", and succeeds in this exceedingly difficult task.

There is mystery about the origins of the Church in Malabar, which claims to have been founded by the apostle Thomas. It would seem to have been Nestorian with an East Syrian connexion before the coming of the Portuguese, then developed Chaldean-Uniate affiliations, from which derive the Romo-Syrians of to-day. But a large section broke away and made contact with the Syrian Jacobites until in modern times one section under Anglican evangelical influence "reformed" to become the Mar Thoma Church and the rest divided over the issue of the relationship with the Patriarch of Antioch. This question led to continued litigation to this day and the two sections are not now in communion, the one owing allegiance to the Patriarch (called Jacobites), the other to the Catholicos (called Orthodox), but there is no doctrinal or liturgical difference between them. Many have tried to settle the issue, including Lord Halifax when Viceroy of India, Bishop Gore, and others. Only a few months ago a group of the Syrians started a fast in Gandhian fashion, but no settlement was reached. To add to the complicated situation, some Syrian families broke away and became Anglicans, and are now in the Church of South India. Bishop Jacob of that church is a Syrian. There is also a small Chaldean (Nestorian) diocese at Trichur.

The historical background is brilliantly set forth in all its complexity, and the story is told discreetly but succinctly of the difficulties which these ancient Christians have had with well-meaning European reformers, their quarrels and schisms. The attitude of the Portuguese does not seem to have been so different from that of the Victorian Anglicans. But conservatism, hand-in-hand with nationalism, baulked the would-be reformers, and the secular power, whether of Goa or Britain, in the person of Colonel Monroe, was not always a happy influence.

The historical section is followed by a remarkable study of the anthropology of the Kerala Christians. Kerala is the name of the area comprising Travancore, Cochin, and Malabar, and is the name given to the new state formed since this book was prepared for publication. This section is of the greatest interest and points out with intimate detail from the life-cycle and customs of the people that these Christians, while preserving their religion largely without syncretism, have successfully integrated themselves with the surrounding Hindu culture. That this involved a caste-like structure is admitted and prevented the Church from being an evangelistic body for centuries. But that was largely true of the Near Eastern Churches also under

the millat system of the Turks. The book concludes with studies of the Sunday Service, Offices both daily and occasional, the worship and the faith of the Syrians of Kerala. Translations are given of some of the beautiful prayers and hymns, and the question is considered carefully whether the Church could be called Orthodox. That it has long ceased to be Nestorian, if ever it was, is certain and its alleged monophysitism may not necessarily involve heresy so much as linguistic confusion. It is significant that in the act of faith signed by every candidate before ordination, while the council of Chalcedon and Leo are condemned, so also are the "heretics" Nestorius and Eutyches. I have been told by more than one Syrian that Eutyches is condemned and it is most unfair to accuse them of his heresy. Bishop Brown has performed a great service to the Ecumenical Movement in giving us this most comprehensive and learned, though always absorbing, study of an ancient church in an ancient land. Both church and land are entering into new and revolutionary ways of life, demanding our prayer and sympathetic interest.

LEONARD M. SCHIFF.

BANGALORE.

PÉGUY. By Alexander Dru. Harvill Press. 15s.

THE HOLY INNOCENTS AND OTHER POEMS. By Charles Péguy. Translated by Pansy Pakenham. Harvill Press. 15s.

Péguy's "point of view", writes Mr Dru, "was an enigma to most of those who knew him", and an enigma he remains even though one has read with care this appreciative essay and these excellent translations of his verse. "He wanted", says Mr Dru, "the best of both worlds and in his poetry tried to express it", and he thus "accounts for [Péguy's] being treated both as a traditionalist and as a revolutionary, a reactionary, and a progressive". He was courageously independent and odd.

Born at Orleans in 1873, the son of a carpenter, Péguy was educated at a lycée and at the Sorbonne. He boldly interrupted his university career to write an historical pageant about St Joan of Arc, which his friends misunderstood and only one or two bought when he published it himself, at the expense of his new wife's dowry; and in the end he left the university without a degree.

Some leading socialists came to rescue his publishing business from the financial rocks, but he would not conform and accept their authority any more, of course, than he would that of the other political parties; and, deciding to go his own way and to have that freedom that was so vital to him, he never enjoyed financial security.

Having left the Church when at college, he returned in 1908, six years before his death at the battle of the Marne in 1914. But he was technically outside the Church, for his wife did not become a Catholic and his children were not baptized. After making a pilgrimage to Chartres for his son's recovery from diphtheria, he wrote:

> I have suffered so much and prayed so much . . . I live without the sacraments. It's a risk. But I have treasures of grace, an inconceivable, super-abundance of grace. I follow the indications.

He maintained that his return had not been a reversal and a conversion but a deepening and a renaissance: "We may have been sinners . . . but we never ceased to be on the right path." He affirmed his invisible, "invincible fidelity . . . [his] altogether natural fidelity" through the period of apparent estrangement, together with the freedom which, as Mr Dru says, "follows when intellect, will, and feeling are united. It is the complete man, the pagan soul which is free, and in that freedom open to grace."

Though without a thorough exploration, Mr Dru, in a book which is by no means easy to grasp and which frequently assumes a great deal of information in the reader, connects this aspect of Péguy's thinking with Coleridge's conception of the imagination and Newman's of the illative sense. Christian faith, as Mr Dru interprets Péguy, issues in and is deepened by action—Péguy wrote a number of political works; it is the capacity to see—and, since it is not a private, though it is a personal, vision, Péguy, who had written no verse until his return to Catholicism, communicated it in his poetry.

This poetry, in Lady Pakenham's translation, is not, to an English reader, exceptionally impressive. But there is about it little if anything that is esoteric or affected, and in "The Mystery of the Holy Innocents", in particular, there are several illuminating images, a disarming freshness, much shrewd psychology and much understanding of the way of the devout and sensible Christian.

> And if you are absolutely determined to offer me something
> At night when going to bed
> Let it be first a thanksgiving
> For all the services I do you . . .
> Thereafter let your self-examination
> Be a cleansing once for all
> And not a dawdling over spots and stains.

R. T. Davies.

University of Liverpool.

SHORTER NOTICES

St Basil the Great and Apollinaris of Laodicea. By G. L. Prestige. Edited from his papers by Henry Chadwick. S.P.C.K. 12s.

All who have benefited from Dr Prestige's work, which was too soon interrupted by his premature death, will be glad to have this last work of his, upon which he was engaged at the time of his death.

It is well known that, ever since 1681 when Cotelier first published the correspondence attributed to St Basil and Apollinaris, its authenticity has been regarded as doubtful. In fact, despite the arguments on the other side put forward by Dräseke in the last century, the prevalent opinion is still that the letters are forgeries produced by

Eustathius of Sebaste. This view is maintained by Loofs and Lietzmann, but Dr Prestige marshals an impressive series of arguments against it. He begins by showing that a number of detailed historical references that occur in the letters are in accord with the complex state of theological controversies about the year 360. Then he argues that Letter 361 appears to have been written before the author had read the *De Synodis* of Athanasius (which was composed about October–November, 359). The same may be said of Letter 362.

On the other hand, according to Prestige, the authenticity of these texts has been rejected because a later protest by Basil, which had nothing to do with them, has been too readily applied to them. This is not to say, however, that Basil, through his eagerness to disavow Apollinaris when he had become a dangerous associate, is free from responsibility for the misunderstanding.

Apart from this particular question, Prestige's study is fascinating because of the light it throws on the earliest origins of the Apollinarian controversy. Many other interesting points are also dealt with, e.g. what is said on p. 21 about St Basil's use of the term *γνῶσις*.

PARIS. LOUIS BOUYER.

THÉOLOGIE DE L'IMAGE DE DIEU CHEZ ORIGÈNE. By Henri Crouzel, S.J. Paris: Aubier. 1,200 francs.

Man's capacity to know something of his Maker, Origen believed, depends upon that point of contact normally described in biblical terms as the image of God. This, however, is also describable in Platonic language about the soul's natural affinity with the divine, and its recollection of the higher world. Is Origen's doctrine of the knowledge of God Platonist or biblical? Again, Christ is the image of God. But this idea can easily be fitted into a Neoplatonist scheme of the hierarchy of being and made to carry the implication that there is some trace of inferiority—a "copy" is not quite as good as an "original". Fr Crouzel, while well aware of the constant Platonic overtones, has evidently been struck by the strength of Origen's allegiance to the faith once delivered to the saints, and finds his treatment of these fundamental matters impressively orthodox. He sees that there is really no tolerable sense in calling Origen a "systematic theologian", and pleads that allowance must be made for symbolic flights of speculation which a mystical writer can get away with more easily than a dogmatic thinker. Jerome and Justinian are not unprejudiced witnesses, and their misrepresentation of Origen (for example, as teaching the soul's transmigration into animal bodies) is fully and rightly recognized. Nevertheless, I venture to think Fr Crouzel over-optimistic. Subordinationism in Origen is rather tendentiously explained away (p. 103). Synergistic passages are treated as rare and untypical, which is but a half-truth. A spectacular example of the author's reluctance to grasp the nettle is his refusal to discuss Origen's belief in the salvability of the devil ("nous n'avons pas le temps de nous y arrêter"); the point is anything but marginal.

However, it must be counted to him for righteousness that he gives us no exaggerated nonsense about the total unreliability of the Latin translations, and his attitude to Rufinus is tempered and sane. This book is good exposition. It would be even better if as critic the author were more hard-headed.

H. Chadwick.

Queens' College,
Cambridge.

Man's Religions. By John B. Noss. Macmillan. 41s. 6d.

This is a revised edition of a book first published in 1949. It contains accounts of the religions of the world in four sections: "Primitive and Bygone Religions", "The Religions of India", "The Religions of the Far East", and "The Religions of the Near East". It will be useful to all who are concerned, at a fairly elementary level, with the comparative study of religions, and also, since it is well indexed, it may serve as a work of reference.

The Church of South India and the Church. By Donald Rea. Confraternity of Unity, 11 Sandringham Close, Enfield. 5s., post free.

The Church of South India: a further stage in development. By Sister Carol Graham. Appeal Committee for Women's Work in the C.S.I., Collingtree, Marlow. 2s.

The former of these booklets is the work of an Anglo-Catholic priest who takes a remarkably sympathetic view of the C.S.I. He calls attention to contemporary ecclesiological trends in the Roman Church which, as he points out, encourage a much more generous appreciation of what is happening in South India than the curiously wooden categories of some Anglo-Catholics. Mr Rea's conclusions are similar to those of Père Bouyer.

Sister Carol Graham's booklet, of which this is the third edition, is of particular interest because it deals fully with women's work and the Order for Women in the C.S.I. There are striking developments here which deserve to be more widely known than they are at present.

A. R. V.

The Country Parson and Selected Poems. By George Herbert. S.C.M. Press. 8s. 6d.

As Dr Hugh Martin writes in his Introduction, "interesting echoes can be traced between the poems and the 'Pastoral' "; thus these words from "Easter":

> I got me flowers to straw thy way:
> I got me boughs off many a tree, etc.,

are not just a fancy; the Parson is to take order that the church is "at great festivalls strawed, and stuck with boughs, and perfumed with incense". The "Pastoral", however, is to be read for its own sake; it is as if Chaucer's Parson had inherited the Knight's courtesy and the lyric note of the Squire. Things were much the same ecclesiastico-socially, yet Hooker had intervened; not only talk of duty to the "Countrey", to the "Common-wealth", but something already in the tone suggests Thomas Arnold, not that in those latter days the Parson would be doubling the rôle of village doctor, preferring "home-bred medicines". "So, where the Apothecary useth either for loosing, Rubarb, or for binding, Bolearmena, the Parson useth damask or white Roses for the one, and plantaine, shepherds purse, knot-grasse for the other, and that with better successe." As a poet Herbert is not perhaps a lesser figure than Donne, while had he lived he might have joined his century's constellation of divines, if indeed he does not shine there in *The Country Parson.*

H. D. Hanshell, S.J.

Beaumont.

Interpreting Paul's Gospel. By A. M. Hunter. S.C.M. Press. 10s. 6d.

Here in less than one hundred and fifty pages Professor Hunter gives one of his characteristically lucid summaries of New Testament teaching and its relevance for to-day. An exposition of Paul's gospel takes more than a third of the work; in the remainder Professor Hunter seeks to show how different aspects of Paul's teaching can illuminate the man-of-to-day's predicament about his own nature, his need for deliverance, for community and for an understanding of the purposes and processes of history. Following Anderson Scott, "salvation", elucidated as past event, present experience and future hope, is taken as the Ariadne's thread which leads through the labyrinth of Paul's thought. This summary, which lacks nothing in clarity, has inevitably sacrificed some of the power of Paul's message. The second part of the book is full of apt quotations and modern instances; but once again one feels that lucidity and relevance has been bought at the loss of some profundity. It will, however, no doubt provide notes for many sermons.

Professor Hunter is so good at this kind of thing that his book will be valuable both to those ministers of the gospel who feel that they require a stimulus to renew their interest in Paul's theology, and to students and others who have not yet managed to see the apostle's thought as a whole. If it leads men to read or re-read Paul's letters, to examine for themselves some of the larger theological commentaries, say of Barth or Nygren, and to live more deeply in the world for whom the apostle wrote, then one imagines that Professor Hunter will be satisfied.

J. D. McCaughey.

Melbourne.

ASSOCIATION OF BRITISH THEOLOGICAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL LIBRARIES

At a meeting held in London on 25 October 1956 this association came formally into existence; its aims, as stated in its constitution, are "to promote the interests of libraries, scholars, and librarians" in the fields of theology and philosophy.

Its foundation membership ranges from large academic libraries to modest society libraries, as well as a number of individuals, and no doubt its numbers will grow as its usefulness becomes increasingly clear. It hopes to help members by the provision and interchange of information, and by undertaking, among other things, projects of bibliographical value. There are two kinds of subscription: individual, 10s. 6d.; corporate, 21s. A bulletin will be issued three times a year, about the middle of each university term. This will be sent free to all members of the Association; non-members will be able to subscribe to it.

The officers are—Chairman: Dr Roger Thomas (Dr Williams's Library, 14 Gordon Square, London, W.C.1); Deputy Chairman: Rev. F. Courtney, S.J. (Heythrop College, Chipping Norton, Oxon.); Hon. Secretary/Treasurer: Miss J. Ferrier (c/o Church Missionary Society Library, 6 Salisbury Square, London, E.C.4). The editor of the bulletin will be Mr R. J. Hoy (School of Oriental and African Studies Library, University of London, London W.C.1).

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

George Allen and Unwin: Wayne E. Oates, *Religious Factors in Mental Illness* (16s.); W. G. Cole, *Sex in Christianity and Psychoanalysis* (21s.).

Church Information Board: *Your Parish Church: Twelfth Report of the Central Council for the Care of Churches* (4s. 6d.); *Old Testament Study Notes* (4s.).

Independent Press: Sydney Myers, *The Ten Words* (12s. 6d.).

Jarrold and Sons: Edward Carpenter, *Westminster Abbey* (3s. 6d.); K. R. Mackenzie, *The Palace of Westminster* (3s. 6d.).

Longmans: J. H. Crehan, S.J. (Ed.), *Athenagoras: Embassy for the Christians, the Resurrection from the Dead* (21s.); J. H. Waszink (Ed.), *Tertullian: The Treatise against Hermogenes* (21s.).

Marshall, Morgan and Scott: T. J. Kleinhans, *Martin Luther, Saint and Sinner* (8s. 6d.).

Michigan University Press (Oxford University Press): Austin Warren, *New England Saints* (30s.).

St Andrew Press: A. L. Drummond, *The Kirk and the Continent* (25s.); G. S. Gunn, *God in the Psalms* (21s.).

S.C.M. Press: John Marsh, *A Year with the Bible* (15s.); Richard Baxter, *The Reformed Pastor* (8s. 6d.); Basil Smallman, *The Background of Passion Music—J. S. Bach and his Predecessors* (8s. 6d.).

Sheed and Ward: John Henry Newman, *Autobiograhical Writings* (18s.).

John Sherratt and Son: Harold Lees (Ed.), *Parsons meet Welfare Workers* (3s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K.: Ernest Evans (Ed.), *Tertullian's Treatise on the Incarnation* (32s. 6d.); J. L. C. Dart, *The Old Religion* (17s. 6d.).

Universities Federation for Animal Welfare: C. W. Hume, *The Status of Animals in the Christian Religion* (8s. 6d.).

University of Chicago Press (Cambridge University Press): Perry D. LeFevre, *The Prayers of Kierkegaard* (27s. 6d.).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LIMITED, GUILDFORD AND LONDON

INTERNATIONAL SUMMER COURSES
at
ST. AUGUSTINE'S, CANTERBURY
The Central College of the Anglican Communion

1957

July 8—20 THE MISSION OF THE CHURCH
July 22—August 3 THE BIBLE TO-DAY
August 5—17 THE MINISTRY OF THE CHURCH

Lecturers include : The Bishop of Stepney,
Canon M. A. C. Warren, Canon C. K. Sansbury,
Professor C. F. D. Moule, Dr Alden D. Kelley (U.S.A.)
The Bishop of Croydon, Canon A. O. Standen

Full details from: The Secretary of the Summer Courses, St. Augustine's College, Canterbury.

MEDIEVAL LATIN DICTIONARIES

NIERMEYER (J.F.). Mediae Latinitatis lexicon minus. In about 10 parts. Part I to IV (A-exactare) ready. each 39s. 6d.

BLAISE (A.). Dictionnaire latin-francaise des auteurs chretiens. 1955. Cloth, £10 · 17 · 6

MAIGNE D'ARNIS. Lexicon manuale ad scriptores mediae et infimae latinitatis. Sewn, £2 · 5 · 6

BAXTER (W.H.) and C. JOHNSON. Medieval Latin Word list from British and Irish Sources, 1934. 21s.

SOUTER (A.). Glossary of later Latin to 600 A.D. £3 · 3 · 0

DU CANGE. Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis. 10 vols. Paris Reprint of Last Edition. Sewn, £50 · 0 · 0

Available from :

W. HEFFER & SONS LTD
Petty Cury, Cambridge, England

CHRIST AND HIS CHURCH

A. NYGREN **10s. 6d. net**

A study in the idea of the Messiahship of Jesus in the New Testament and its basis in the Old, and of the significance of the idea for our understanding of the nature of the Church.

DISCIPLINES OF THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

E. HAYMAN **5s. net**

The author, an Oblate of the Community of the Servants of the Will of God, expounds the life of prayer as a process of learning the love of God, the humility, obedience and purity of Jesus, and of learning to share his pain.

THE PRAYER BOOK PATTERN

A Consideration

CAROLINE ADAMS **12s. 6d. net**

An examination, by a Solitary of the Church in Wales, of the Prayer Book's essential pattern for worship and life.

THE WILL AND THE WAY

HARRY BLAMIRES **15s. net**

In what ways does God act today upon the human scene? What is the nature of his interference in our daily lives? The modern mind regards such questions as starting-points for discussion, as mental cocktails to stimulate brains and loosen tongues. But the Christian Faith has clear answers *if* we are prepared to find that he whom we invited to advise, help and strengthen comes to in-dwell, direct and command.

S·P·C·K